The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIII, No. 2 August, 1945

CONTENTS

Unde et Memores . . . . . *William J. Lallou* 81

The Catholic Public School Teacher
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 94

Russia and the Catholic Church . *Stephen C. Gulovich* 105

Guidance and Counselling . . . . . *Rudolf Allers* 117

Censures for the Confessor . . *Thomas Owen Martin* 131

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Record of Private Baptism 148

Doubtful Impotence 148

Hebrew Tribal Intermarriage 149

The Serpent of *Gen.* 3:1-15 149

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1945, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

BOOK REVIEWS

Christianity in the Market-Place, *by Michael de la Bedoyere* 153

Freedom through Education,
by John D. Redden and Francis A. Ryan 155

An Introduction to Philosophy, *by Paul J. Glenn* . . . 157

Saints for Girls, *by a Servite Nun* 158

Priesthood, *by Aloysius Biskupek* 159

BOOK NOTES 160

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

We Solicit Your Co-operation

Notice of change of address should be sent to us promptly, and at the same time the old address should be given.

Sometimes a subscriber overlooks reporting change of address; and now and then a subscriber dies, and in either case his copy continues to be sent to his former address. In such cases notification from Successor or Pastor would be appreciated.

You May Use the Blank Below:

NAME: .....

OLD ADDRESS: .....

NEW ADDRESS: .....

OTHER INFORMATION: .....

The American Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

UNDE ET MEMORES

It is usual to classify the four New Testament accounts of the Last Supper in two divisions, known respectively as the Petrine form and the Pauline form. The former comprises the versions of St. Matthew (26:26-28) and St. Mark (14:22-24) while the Pauline form is recorded by St. Luke (22:19-20) and St. Paul himself (*I Cor.* 11:23-25). One of the details which mark the distinction between the two forms is that of the precept of renovation which, absent in the Petrine version, appears once, after the consecration of the bread, in St. Luke's Gospel and, in the account in the First Corinthians, is found both after the consecration of the bread and after that of the wine. St. Luke has: "Do this for a commemoration of Me," and St. Paul almost the same words after the form for the bread: "This do for the commemoration of Me," and the following repetition after the form for the chalice: "This do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of Me." In the succeeding verse (26), St. Paul continues the idea of renewal with: "For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord until He come." Our Lord, then, directed His apostles and, through them, all His priests to do in memory of Him what He had done at the Last Supper. So every priest, rightly ordained, when he exercises his sacerdotal ministry by doing the stupendous thing which Christ Himself performed before His betrayal to His enemies, is fulfilling the divine injunction and acting in memory of Jesus Christ in precisely the way that the Lord directed that His memory should be continued on earth. Hence, in all liturgies, the words of institution are followed by a prayer assuring our Lord that we are mindful of Him. This prayer is technically known as the Anamnesis (from ἀναμιμνήσκω), and in the Roman Mass it is the *Unde et memores.*

In the Mozarabic Liturgy this prayer is known as the *Post pridie* because it follows the words of institution. The Gallican liturgies know it as the *Post mysteria* or *Post secreta,* owing to its position immediately after the mystery of consecration, the word *secreta* in this connection being about equivalent to *mysteria.* St. Isidore calls it the *Confirmatio* because it is the introduction to the Epiclesis. In the Byzantine liturgies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom it

begins with the words *μεμνημένοι οὖν*, and in the Liturgy of St. James the initial words are the similar: *μεμνημένος οὖν*.

The prayer, as defined by Cabrol,[1] includes not only the enumeration of the mysteries of the life of our Lord, which priest and people have in mind, but the act of offering the Holy Sacrifice with this appreciative memory of the passion and death and resurrection and ascension of our Saviour and often encloses the invocation of the Holy Spirit for the consecration of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. Thus, the component parts of the Anamnesis may be listed as follows: (1) the opening words, the nexus with the *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem;* (2) the enumeration of the mysteries of our Saviour's life which we have in mind; (3) the prayer of offering, *de tuis donis et datis, panem, sanctum, calicem salutis,* along with the references to the the Old Testament sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedech; (4) the Epiclesis, to which the memory of the resurrection and ascension leads because of the natural sequence which brings in the idea of the coming of the Paraclete. The Epiclesis itself, whether or not a consecratory invocation of the Holy Spirit, naturally must be regarded as a separate prayer, to which the Anamnesis is merely a logical introduction. In this study, we are concerned only with the prefatory section of the post-consecration prayer with its enumeration of the mysteries which the celebrant declares that he has in mind as he offers the sacrifice in obedience to the divine precept of renewal of the Last Supper.

Immediately following the words of consecration in our present-day Mass we say "Haec quotiescumque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis." Continuing the same idea, the first prayer after consecration is an Anamnesis: "Unde et memores, Domine, nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua sancta, ejusdem Christi Filii tui Domini nostri tam beatae passionis, necnon et ab inferis resurrectionis, sed et in coelos gloriosae ascensionis." At this point is introduced the main clause of the prayer: "offerimus praeclarae majestati tuae de tuis donis et datis," etc. The evident meaning is that it is because we do remember our Lord and the various mysteries of His life on earth and hence also because we are mindful of His precept to repeat what He first performed at the Last Supper when we should

[1] Cf. Cabrol, "Anamnèse," *Dictionnaire d' archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (Paris, 1925).

make commemoration of Him that we are now offering this sacrifice, "offerimus praeclarae majestati tuae de tuis donis ac datis."

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE *UNDE ET MEMORES*

It is not too much to believe that some form of Anamnesis was in the primitive Canon used by the apostles themselves. When our Lord first consecrated bread and wine into His Body and Blood, apart from the implication of His death in the sacramental separation of the flesh from its life-giving fluid, He emphasized the identity of the transubstantiated bread with the body *given* for us (*Luke* 22:19) *or delivered* for us (*I Cor.* 11:24) and, in all four accounts of the institution, the identity of the consecrated wine with the blood shed for us. Explicitly, in St. Luke, after the consecration of the bread, He directs the apostles, "Do this for a commemoration of me," which precept in St. Paul's account (*I Cor.* 11:25) is repeated after the consecration of the chalice. Moreover, St. Paul (*loc. cit.* 5:26) adds the significant words: "As often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice you shall shew the death of the Lord until he come." It seems reasonable to conclude that St. Paul himself in the Eucharistic sacrifice made use of prayers which emphasized that the "breaking of bread" was a divinely appointed memorial of Jesus Christ, especially of His passion and death. That earliest description of the Mass, contained in the *First Apology,* addressed by St. Justin Martyr to the Emperor Antoninus Pius and therefore dating from mid-second century, contains an indirect reference to an Anamnesis in the liturgy of the Church, since, in his explanation of the Blessed Eucharist, St. Justin quotes our Lord as saying, after the consecration at the Last Supper, "Do this in memory of me."[2] This is still more explicit in the same author's *Dialogue with Trypho,*[3] where he declares that the Lord commanded the Eucharist to be made in memory of His passion (εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους). The oldest actual text of an Anamnesis extant today is found in the *S. Hippolyti traditio apostolica,* a document of the early third century, in which we read: "Memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis ejus offerimus tibi panem et calicem, gratias tibi agentes qui nos dignos habuisti adstare coram te et tibi ministrare." The invocation of the Holy Spirit follows.[4] This is the form in which the same

[2] *Apol.,* LXVI, 3. [3] *Dial.,* XLI, 117.

[4] Cf. Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima* (Bonn, 1935-37), p. 30.

prayer is found in the later *Testamentum Domini Nostri* and, somewhat expanded, in Book VIII of the *Apostolic Constitutions,* to both of which reference will be made below.

St. Cyprian (†258) tells us that there was mention of the passion of Christ in every sacrifice[5] and, later on in the same letter,[6] that the resurrection of the Lord was celebrated in the morning, which may well imply a mention of this mystery in the prayers of Mass. The *Euchologium Sarapionis,* a prayer book of the third century Bishop of Thmuis, in Egypt, sets down an Anamnesis of only the death of our Lord: "Itaque et nos agentes similitudinem mortis hujus (*ὁμοίωμα τοῦ θάνατου*) offerimus hunc panem," etc.[7] The *Deir-Belizeh,* a tattered papyrus of the seventh century, which records an Egyptian liturgy, about contemporary with Sarapion, has an Anamnesis of both the death and the resurrection, "Quotiescumque manducabitis panem hunc et calicem illum bibetis mortem meam annuntiate et resurrectionem meam confitemini. Mortem tuam annuntiamus et resurrectionem tuam confitemur."[8] The fourth century *Testamentum Domini Nostri,* edited by the Catholic Syrian Patriarch Rahmani, contains this Anamnesis: "Memores ergo mortis tuae et resurrectionis tuae offerimus tibi panem et calicem, gratias agentes tibi qui es solus Deus in saeculum et salvator noster quoniam nos dignos effecisti ut staremus coram te et sacerdotio fungeremus."[9] This form repeats that of the earlier *S. Hippolyti traditio,* to which reference was made above. While it is true that the *Liber Pontificalis* attributes the introduction of this memorial prayer to Pope Alexander I (second century): "Hic passionem Domini miscuit in praedicatione sacerdotum quando missae celebrantur,"[10] it seems more probable that the Anamnesis is more ancient than the time of Alexander I and even of apostolic usage. Moreover, there are those who consider that the words of the *Liber Pontificalis* just cited are rather to be understood as concerning the introduction at Rome of the clause, "Qui pridie quam pateretur," into the form of consecration.[11]

[5] Cf. Cyprian, *Ep.* LXIII, 10. [6] Cf. *ibid.,* 16. [7] Quasten, *op. cit.,* pp. 59 ff.

[8] Cf. DePuniet, "Le nouveau papyrus liturgique d'Oxford," *Revue Benedictine,* XXVI (1909).

[9] Quasten, *op. cit.,* p. 254.

[10] *Liber pontificalis,* Ed. Duchesne (Paris, 1886), I, 27.

[11] Cf. Probst, *Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte* (Tubingen, 1879) and *Liturgie des vierten Jahrhundert's und deren Reform* (Munster, 1893).

The celebrated Eighth Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* gives us the first complete text of the Antiochene Liturgy. The document itself is of the fourth century but the liturgical formulas are regarded to be the far greater antiquity. Indeed, when the early Fathers of the Church quote liturgical prayers, the expressions are usually found to be those of the text of *Apostolic Constitutions,* Book VIII. The Anamnesis, in this liturgy, agrees with the earliest text of this prayer, that of the *S. Hippolyti traditio,*[12] of which it is the following expanded version: "Memores igitur passionis ejus et mortis et a mortuis resurrectionis et in coelos reditus et futuri ejus secundi adventus . . . offerimus tibi per eum secundum mandatum ejus panem hunc et calicem hunc gratias tibi per eum agentes quod nos dignos putasti qui staremus coram te et sacerdotio fungeremur tibi."[13]

The *De Sacramentis,* a treatise of the end of the fourth, or beginning of the fifth, century, whose Ambrosian authorship is now less disputed than formerly, contains certain excerpts from the Canon of the Mass, which parallel the text of the Missal today. The passages are familiar to all clerics in major orders as they are read in the lessons of the second nocturn on the Wednesday during the octave of *Corpus Christi.* Book IV, Chapter vi, 27, records the Anamnesis, immediately following the words of institution, in this form: "Ergo memores gloriosissimae ejus passionis et ab inferis resurrectionis et in coelum ascensionis offerimus tibi hanc immaculatam hostiam, rationabilem hostiam, incruentam hostiam, hunc panem sanctum et calicem vitae aeternae." No one can fail to be impressed by the almost word-for-word identity of this form of Anamnesis with the prayer which every priest of the Roman Liturgy has recited at Mass for centuries. Passion and resurrection and ascension are the mysteries of our Saviour explicitly commemorated today as they were when the text of *De sacramentis* was set down and, no doubt, long before that time. The more ancient form employs the superlative *gloriosissimae* where we used the more restrained *gloriosae* and applies this adjective to all three mysteries mentioned while we restrict it to the ascension and speak of the passion as blessed. The expressions further on in the prayer in *De sacramentis,* though including some which have found their way into our *Quam oblationem,* are, in the main those recited at the

[12] Cf. *supra.*

[13] Quasten, *op. cit.,* 223.

present day as the priest traces the five signs of the cross over the newly-consecrated elements.

THE *UNDE ET MEMORES* IN WESTERN RITES

The text of the *Unde et memores,* precisely as we read it today, is found in our oldest sacramentaries, which contain the Canon of the Mass, namely, the Gelasian and the Gregorian. The older Leonine lacks the *Unde et memores* for the obvious reason that the portion of the manuscript, which included the Canon, is missing. There are, indeed, such very minor variations as the word, *sumus,* after *memores* in the Gelasian book and the omission of *ejusdem* before *Christi* in the Gregorian Sacramentary. The Missals of the derived monastic rites of the Western Liturgy, the Carthusian, the Carmelite, and the Dominican rites have Anamneses identical with our own. The Ambrosian Rite of Milan has exactly our *Unde et memores,* except for *mirabilis* before *resurrectionis et gloriosissimae* with *ascensionis.* The extinct rites of Sarum and Hereford and York had our form also. The same is true of the Rite of Lyons and of that of Braga. The Carmelites and Dominicans and the priests of the Ambrosian Rite and of the Lyonnaise are directed to extend the arms in the form of the cross during the recitation of the Anamnesis. This was also a feature of the obsolete Sarum Rite. The Mozarabic Liturgy has a great number of variable *Post pridie prayers,* the equivalent of the *Unde et memores* in the Roman Liturgy. There is, moreover, in the Rite of Toledo, in every Mass, after the consecration of the bread this brief form of Anamnesis: "Quotiescumque manducaveritis hoc facite in meam commemorationem." This is repeated after the consecration of the wine, with the appropriate substitution of the word *biberitis,* and after the consecration of both species, the celebrant adds: "Quotiescumque manducaveritis panem hunc et calicem istum biberitis mortem Domini annuntiabitis donec veniet. In claritatem ✠ de coelis. *R.* Amen."[14]

The old Gallican sacramentaries, like the *Missale Gothicum* and the *Missale Gallicanum vetus,* have variable Anamneses, called prayers *Post mysteria* in the former and *Post secreta* in the latter, which peculiarity is retained, as we noted above, in the Mozarabic Rite. The *Missale Francorum,* a fragmentary uncial manuscript

[14] Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus* (Leipsig, 1847), I, 89.

of the seventh century, provides nothing pertinent to the present matter. The *Missale Gothicum,* of the end of the seventh century, has the following Anamnesis, which is very nearly our own: "Memores gloriosissimae Domini passionis et ab inferis resurrectionis offerimus tibi hanc immaculatam hostiam, etc."[15] Duchesne cites from the same book this sample of a *Post mysteria* prayer, which is proper for Christmas Day: "Credimus, Domine, adventum tuum; recolimus passionem tuam."[16]

THE ANAMNESIS IN EASTERN LITURGIES

The Eastern Anamnesis follows the pattern of this prayer in the Liturgy described in the Eighth Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions.* The commemoration of the passion, death, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord, followed by the expression of hope in His second coming, led naturally to the idea of the sending of the Paraclete and this in turn to the invocation of the Holy Spirit if not to effect, at least to perfect and declare, the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. It must be noted that any really consecratory effect of such an Epiclesis is opposed to Catholic teaching. We have given above the text of this Anamnesis which is the exemplar for all similar prayers in the Oriental liturgies. So, in the Liturgy of St. James, we find: "Do this for a remembrance of Me, for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye set forth the death of the Son of Man and confess His resurrection till He come." The deacon answers: "We believe and confess." And the people: "We set forth Thy death, O Lord, and confess Thy resurrection." The priest continues: "We therefore also sinners remembering His life-giving passion, His salutary cross, His death and resurrection from the dead on the third day, His ascension into heaven and session at the right hand of Thee, His God and Father, and His glorious and terrible coming again when He shall come with glory to judge the quick and the dead and to render to every man according to his works, offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice, etc."[17] The prayer of Epiclesis follows.

[15] Thomasi-Vessosi, *Opera,* VI, 336.

[16] Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien* (Paris, 1925), p. 230.

[17] Neale-Littledale, *Translations of the Primitive Liturgies* (London, 1859), p. 50.

In the Liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites, immediately after the words of institution, the priest adds: "Do this in remembrance of Me, for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do proclaim My death and confess My resurrection until I come." The people then say: "Thy death, O Lord, we commemorate and Thy resurrection we confess and Thy second coming we hope for and we ask Thee mercy and compassion and we implore the forgiveness of sins. Thy mercies be upon us all." The priest resumes with: "Commemorating therefore, O Lord, Thy death and Thy resurrection on the third day from the tomb and Thine ascension into heaven and Thy session at the right hand of God the Father and as well Thy second coming fearful and glorious wherein Thou shalt judge the world in righteousness, when Thou shalt render to every one according to his deeds, we offer Thee this fearful and unbloody sacrifice that Thou deal not with us after our sins, etc."[18] After a few more petitions, the invocation of the Holy Spirit follows.

In the Nestorian Rite of Persia, several prayers intervene between the words of institution and this form of Anamnesis: "We also, O Lord, . . . commemorating and celebrating this great and fearful and holy and lifegiving and divine mystery of the passion and death and burial and resurrection of our Lord, our Saviour, Jesus Christ," etc.[19] Similarly, the Malabar Liturgy interposes prayers of petition between the words of institution and the precept of renovation and the Anamnesis, which greatly resembles the Nestorian form, just quoted: "We, therefore . . . glorify, exalt, and venerate this memorial and sacrifice this mystery, great, terrible, holy, and divine of the passion and death, burial and resurrection of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ."[20] The Maronite Liturgy, a much-Romanized version of the Jerusalem-Antioch family, has an Anamnesis of only the passion and resurrection following the consecration and mere traces of an Epiclesis in the succeeding prayer.[21]

In the Armenian Liturgy, after the words of institution and an expanded form of the precept of renovation, we find this form of Anamnesis: "We, therefore, O Lord, presenting unto Thee, accord-

[18] Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford, 1896), I, 87 f.

[19] Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

[20] Neale-Littledale, *op. cit.*, p. 166 f.

[21] Cf. Janin, *Les Rites Orientaux* (Paris, 1926), p. 546.

ing to Thy commandment, this saving mystery of the Body and Blood of Thine only-begotten, do remember the saving sufferings He endured for us, His life-giving crucifixion, His burial of three days, His blessed resurrection, His divine ascension and His session at Thy right hand, O Father, and we confess and bless His fearful and glorious second coming."[22]

The Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great has the choir answer "Amen" after each form of consecration, the priest continuing with bowed head to recite this Anamnesis: "Do this in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat of this bread and drink this cup ye declare My death and confess My resurrection. Therefore, we also, O Master, remembering this saving passion, this quickening cross, the three-day burial, the resurrection from the dead, the ascension into heaven, the session at Thy right hand, God and Father, and His glorious and terrible second coming, offer Thee Thine own of Thine own," etc.[23]

The great Eastern Rite of St. John Chrysostom has no citation of the precept of renovation in connection with the words of institution from which the celebrant proceeds immediately to this Anamnesis: "We, therefore, remembering this salutary precept and all that happened on our behalf, the cross, the tomb, the resurrection on the third day, the ascension into heaven, the session on the right hand, the second and glorious coming again, on behalf of all and for all we offer Thee Thine own of Thine own."[24]

Turning now to the Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Liturgy of St. Mark provides after the account of the institution the following prayer of memorial: "Do this in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye shew forth My death and confess My resurrection and ascension until I come. O Almighty Lord and Master, King of heaven, we, announcing the death of Thine only-begotten Son, our Lord and God and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and confessing His blessed resurrection from the dead on the third day, confess also His ascension into heaven and His session on Thy right hand, His God and Father, looking also for His second and dreadful coming when He shall come to judge the quick and the dead in righteousness and to render to every man ac-

[22] Brightman, *op. cit.*, pp. 437 f.

[23] Neale-Littledale, *op. cit.*, pp. 133 f.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

cording to his works: O Lord, our God, we have set before Thee Thine own of Thine own gifts."[25] The Coptic Jacobites of Egypt say: "Showing the death and confessing the resurrection and ascension and session at the right hand and looking for His second coming."[26] Their cousins, the Abyssinian Jacobites, have the people add to the first mention of the precept of renovation: "We show Thy death, O Lord, and Thine holy resurrection; we believe Thine ascension; we praise Thee and confess Thee, O Lord, our God." The priest continues: "Now also, O Lord, remembering His death and resurrection, we confess Thee and offer unto Thee this bread and this cup," etc.[27]

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE *UNDE ET MEMORES*

It is the doctrine of the Church that the Mass is a true sacrifice substantially identical with that of the Cross of Calvary, differing from the latter only in the bloodless and painless manner in which it is offered. The Mass is the repetition of the Last Supper by the human priest, acting as the minister of the great High Priest, Jesus Christ. The sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrifice of the Last Supper agree in the identity of the Divine Victim and of the principal priest, our Lord Himself, in both instances. They agree also in the sacramental character of the mode of offering. Both have reference to the supremely absolute sacrifice of the Cross, to which the Last Supper looked in prospect as the Mass does in retrospect. It is the death of Christ, the actual separation of His Precious Blood from His Sacred Body, which is presented sacramentally by the two-fold consecration, first of the bread and then of the wine. The association of the Mass with the sacrifice of the Cross suggests at once the inclusion of prayers expressing this connection, even apart from the word of Jesus Christ at the very moment of consecration designating the bread as changed into the Body, which was given (delivered) for us, and the wine into the Blood which was shed for us; apart from the precept of our Saviour that we repeat what He did in memory of Him; apart from St. Paul's declaration that whenever we consecrate at Mass and receive the result of that consecration in Holy Communion we show forth the death of the Lord through all ages until His second coming.

It is, therefore, a logical conclusion that from the first celebration

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 22 f. [26] Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. 178. [27] *Ibid.*, pp. 232 f.

of Mass by the apostles, ordained priests by the Divine Bishop, a prayer indicating a conscious memory of our Saviour's injunction to repeat what He did at the Last Supper in appreciative commemoration has always formed part of the liturgical prayers. When the extempore words used by the bishops and priests of apostolic times were committed to writing, no doubt some form of Anamnesis was at once given definite expression. The memorial prayer itself must be far more ancient than the oldest actual text, which has come down to us, that of the *S. Hippolyti traditio apostolica.*[28] Since the eucharistic liturgy is the commemorative sacrifice of the passion and death of Jesus Christ, an Anamnesis of these mysteries has always been an integral part of the prayer of consecration. Beginning with a memory of the passion and death on the cross and the three days' burial, the idea of resurrection is naturally concomitant. Our Lord Himself at the Last Supper suggested His resurrection and ascension and enthronement at the right hand of the Father by His declaration that He would not again taste of the fruit of the vine until His Messianic kingdom had been inaugurated. So, the early forms of the Anamnesis speak both of the death and the resurrection. The idea of the death is expanded to include the passion and the burial and the idea of resurrection to include the ascension and the seating at the right hand of the Father.

The second coming of Christ is at once suggested, especially as it is intimated in St. Paul's verse concerning the Eucharist as showing forth the death of the Lord *until He come.* So, when we arrive at the fourth century compilation of the primitive Antiochene Liturgy in the Eighth Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions,* we have memory in the Anamnesis of five of the mysteries just named: the passion, the death, the resurrection, the ascension, and the second coming. In our Roman Canon we mention only the passion, resurrection, and ascension. The mysteries have varied in their enumeration in different liturgies, as we have already seen, but usually they have centered about the death and the resurrection of our Lord. Arnobius Junior, of the first half of the fifth century, for instance, tells us that in some places the birth of our Saviour was commemorated: "tam venerandae nativitatis quam beatae passionis."[29] The Oriental liturgies have multiplied the number of

[28] Cf. *supra.*

[29] Cf. *MPL* 151: col. 985; also Morin "L'anamèse de la messe romaine dans la première moitié du Ve siècle," *Revue Bénédictine,* XXIV, 407.

mysteries commemorated in the Anamnesis while the Western rites have limited them to three and, in some of the old Gallican service books even to the original two, the death and the resurrection.

The adjectives which qualify the names of the mysteries in our *Unde et memores* have been the subject of commentary in various treatises on the text of the Mass. The passion is described as *beata* because of its happy result in the triumph of the resurrection and because it is the source of our happiness. The word *resurrectionis* is left without modifying adjective unless *gloriosae* can be applied to it gramatically as it surely can objectively with as great reason as it does to *ascensionis*. The *ab inferis,* from lower parts, is predicated of the tomb with reference to the body of Christ and of Limbo with reference to His soul.[30] Associating the events of our Lord's life with the subsequent attributes said later in the prayer of the consecrated Host, one author writes: "Dominus Jesus in *passione* sua fuit *hostia pura,* in *resurrectione* hostia *sancta,* in *ascensione* sua hostia *immaculata.*"[31]

As in the *Orate fratres* and the *Hanc igitur,* so also in the *Unde et memores,* priest and people are united in the offering of the sacrifice. Here we have *nos servi tui,* anciently, the bishop with his concelebrating priests, but today the individual priest alone, and *plebs tua sancta,* the assisting people who join with the celebrant not indeed as co-consecrators but as co-offerers who will participate in the same Holy Communion with the officiating priest. These expressions, like the *meum ac vestrum sacrificium* of the *Orate fratres,* the *qui tibi offerunt* of the *Memento vivorum,* and the *oblationem servitutis nostrae sed et cunctae familiae tuae* of the *Hanc igitur,* are indicative of the real share which the congregation and the faithful generally have in the Mass. It is not within the scope of this article to discuss the meaning and extent of the participation of the laity in the great act of the Divine Liturgy but, although their co-operation is far below that of the priest, who in the person of Christ Himself performs the actual consecration and oblation, yet those assisting at Mass are not to regard themselves as mere spectators but as real participants, in however minor a role, in the sacred drama of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

[30] Cf. Le Brun, *Spiegazione della messa* (Verona, 1752), *Tom. I, Pars. IV, Art. XI.*

[31] Richardus Weddinghusanus, *Libello de canone mystici libaminis, MPL* 177 : 463.

The words of our *Unde et memores* form a simple and direct prayer which offers none of the difficulties presented by such portions of the Canon as the *Quam oblationem* or the *Supplices te rogamus*. Nevertheless, it is a significant prayer of the Mass, emphasizing the relationship of the sacrifice of the altar to the sacrifice of Calvary. The memorial character of the Mass envelops it as with a cloud of incense, thick with the perfume of appreciative commemoration, throughout the Canon. The Anamnesis takes us back to the "breaking of bread" of apostolic times, even to the first of all Masses, celebrated by the High Priest Himself, because it is a development of the precept of renewal of the Last Supper given by Jesus Christ as He consecrated the bread and wine in the upper chamber in Jerusalem, to be recited every time that, in obedience to the divine command, Mass would be celebrated throughout the ages until the Son of Man come in glory to render to every man according to his deeds.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the August, 1895, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* an anonymous article discusses the recent book of the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Satolli, entitled *Loyalty to Church and State.* The reviewer comments especially on the ideas therein proposed concerning the separation of Church and State: "Not a few eminent Catholics have expressed their conviction that the separation of Church and State is the ideal to be aimed at in modern society . . . yet, absolutely, the principle of separation, as vulgarly understood, is false both in practice and in theory". . . . Fr. Maas, S.J., writes on the synoptic problem, discussing this vexed question under the three-fold heading of the theory of mutual dependence, the theory of written sources, the theory of mixed sources. . . . Fr. Poland, S.J., develops the theological argument for the immorality of suicide, replying to the various arguments that are sometimes adduced in defense of self-murder. The practical need of such an article appears in an item in this same issue asserting that in recent years there has been an abnormal increase of suicides in the United States, and a "Suicide Club" was being established in New York. . . . Fr. Sabetti, S.J., writing on "The Catholic Church and Obstetrical Science," refutes an article which had appeared in the *Medical Record,* one which claimed that the Catholic Church never condemned craniotomy and that some Catholic theologians favored it.

F. J. C.

THE CATHOLIC PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER

The work of educating youth has always been regarded as an important and dignified profession. St. John Chrysostom extols the office of teacher in these words: "What is greater than to rule souls, to mold the conduct of youth? I consider him who knows how to form the souls of the young more excellent than any painter or any sculptor."[1] This is especially true of the school teacher in charge of children during the formative period of their lives. Often the teacher exerts a greater influence on the development of the child's character than either the parents or the priest. Certainly, one who chooses the profession of a teacher undertakes a grave responsibility.

However, the teacher's influence and responsibility are exercised in full measure only when education is given in its integrity—that is, not only the training of the mind but also the guidance of the will, permeated with religious instruction and inspiration. Unfortunately, this type of education is not available in the public schools of the United States. In educational institutions maintained at public expense religious instruction is excluded from the regular curriculum. It is well to remember that until about 1840 religious training was a part of the program in our public schools. It was excluded mainly through the efforts of Horace Mann, not because he was opposed to religious instruction but because he realized the difficulty of giving such instruction in a manner that would be acceptable to the many religious groups existing in the United States.[2]

On this account mainly, the Catholic Church disapproves the system of education prevailing in the public schools of our country—not because of its positive factors, the type of instruction it provides, but because of its negative aspect, the exclusion of religion. The Church's attitude is clearly expressed in the Code of Canon Law, which forbids the attendance of Catholic children at "neutral" schools (schools in which there is no religious instruction), unless the Ordinary deems a sufficient reason is present for tolerating

[1] *In Cap. 18, Matt., Hom. 60.*

[2] Cf. John K. Sharp, *Aims and Methods of Teaching Religion* (New York, 1929), Chap. I.

such attendance.[3] With the increase of Catholic schools throughout the United States in recent years and the greater availability of transportation facilities for schoolchildren, the need for tolerating the attendance of Catholic children at public schools is certainly less than it was a generation ago. We may even look forward hopefully to the time when a place in a Catholic school will be granted to every Catholic child in the land, at least as far as the elementary grades are concerned.

In view of this attitude of the Catholic Church toward the public school, the position of a Catholic as a teacher in such a school may seem anomolous. The question might be asked: "What justification has a Catholic for co-operating in a system of education the Catholic Church condemns?" Our answer is that, since there is nothing positively wrong about our public school system of education (its objectional feature being the lack of something which is necessary for the integrity of education), and since the situation would not be improved if Catholics withdrew from the work of public school education, it is perfectly lawful for Catholic men and women to teach in the public schools. Indeed, it is even desirable that Catholics undertake this profession, provided they are intelligent and practical members of the Church. For, although religious instruction is excluded from the public school program, it is supposed to include some form of natural ethical training; and Catholics who know and practise the moral code of Catholicism are better equipped than teachers of other denominations to provide this phase of education.

The Catholic public school teacher will from time to time be confronted with the problem as to the course she may or should follow consistently with her religious belief in some situation connected with her professional activities.[4] Priests engaged in the parochial ministry, to whom teachers naturally refer such doubts, should be prepared to solve them in such wise that, on the one hand there will be no infringement of any Catholic principle, and on the other hand the teacher will not be burdened with restrictions and obligations not called for by the norms of Catholic theology.

[3] Can. 1374.

[4] In the course of this article we shall refer to the Catholic school teacher in the feminine gender, since the majority of our public school teachers are women.

The purpose of this paper is to consider some situations and to propose a reasonable solution.

Generally speaking, there is not sufficient collaboration between priests and Catholic school teachers in our country. Doubtless there are faults on both sides. Some priests seem to extend the Church's attitude of disapproval of public schools to all who participate in public school education. They seem to take it for granted that the teacher is unorthodox in her educational ideas from the very fact that she teaches in a school from which religion has been excluded. Of course, this is quite illogical. A teacher may herself accept the true Catholic ideal of education, even though she is using in her daily work a system that falls far short of that ideal. Again, when a particularly brilliant or efficient Catholic teacher is in the public school and there is common talk that she is more successful in her work than the parochial school teachers, a pastor may yield to a slight feeling of resentment that she has not devoted herself to the cause of Catholic education.

On the other hand, some of the Catholic teachers in our public schools assume a strange attitude toward the priest and their fellow Catholics. I am referring, not to those who bring discredit to the Church by their disregard of the norms of personal conduct expected of a Catholic, but rather to those who are above reproach in their practise of their religious duties, yet stay aloof from parish activities, such as sodalities and study clubs, and seldom meet the priest. Perhaps in some cases this attitude arises from a feeling of superiority over the less educated members of the parish with whom they would come in contact in such gatherings. Or, perhaps some entertain a latent fear that it will be a hindrance to promotion in their profession if they are outspoken in their loyalty to the Catholic Church. Again, there are some teachers who feel a certain resentment toward their pastor because they find in their classes problem children who have been rejected from the parochial school, either because of a lack of talent or because of misconduct.[5]

[5] To attempt a solution of this vexing problem viewed in all its angles is beyond the scope of this article. Much could be said on both sides. Certainly, the pastor has no obligation to keep in his school children who would be detrimental to the intellectual or moral development of the others. At the same time, it is tragic when a Catholic school expels a child who is particularly in need of Catholic training. And one can certainly sympathize with the public school teacher called to educate a group of such outcasts.

It would be to the advantage of both sides if better relations were established between them. Certainly, the teacher should take an active part in the spiritual and social movements of her parish, both for her own benefit and for the welfare of others. The pastor should welcome this collaboration, since her abilities and her standing in the community should prove a valuable asset. He should manifest a spirit of friendliness toward those engaged in public school work within the boundaries of his parish. There is no reason why he should not occasionally visit the public school. No reasonable person would interpret this as giving approval to non-religious education, and it should be beneficial to all concerned. It would be a source of encouragement to the Catholic teachers, and it would tend to break down the prejudice of the non-Catholics. It might help toward securing the co-operation of the school authorities in the matter of getting the children to Mass on holydays, to afternoon weekly instructions, etc. One of the outstanding members of our hierarchy at the present time has the custom of visiting the public schools in his episcopal city, and even of entering the classrooms.

The Catholic public school teacher should realize that she has opportunities of doing much for the benefit of religion. This does not mean that she is expected to exert any direct influence to induce the non-Catholic pupils to become Catholics. However dearly she may love her religion and however ardently she may desire to convince others of its truth, she should abstain from taking the initiative in bringing the arguments for Catholicism to the notice of those under her care. Such a procedure would be a violation of the agreement (or at least tacit understanding) with which she acpected her position, and would probably result in detriment to the common good of religion far exceeding the good that might be done for individual souls. However, if a Catholic teacher is asked by a pupil to explain some point of Catholic teaching, she should give the information clearly and adequately. But if she is requested to give more extended instruction, it would generally be advisable to have the case referred to a priest.

At times, the textbook used in class may contain statements relative to the Catholic Church that are false or misleading. This is particularly true in the history class. The Catholic teacher should not hesitate to bring out the truth on such occasions. It would be deplorable if a Catholic teacher allowed a calumny on the Church

to pass unrefuted because she feared for the security of her position or she dreaded being regarded as a "bigoted Catholic."

Neither should the Catholic teacher hesitate to give the solution taught by her religion to problems of a moral or social nature which may be discussed in class. Particularly in high school classes on social or civic topics she may be required to give a decision on such matters as divorce, euthanasia, birth control, the rights of the individual in relation to the State, the mutual obligations of employer and employee, the right of the parent to educate children as contrasted to the right of the civil authorities, etc. The doctrine of the Catholic Church on such subjects is simply the teaching of the moral law, binding all human beings, and the Catholic teacher is in no way infringing on her agreement not to impose specifically Catholic tenets on the class when she proposes the doctrine proposed by the Church and Catholic scholars.

It may happen that a class manual presents without any qualification the evolutionary explanation of the origin of the human race as a demonstrated fact. The Catholic teacher in commenting on this subject will make the proper distinctions. She will point out that the human soul, being a spiritual substance, could not have originated by the evolution of any lower form of life. The body of man could have been the product of a development from some species of animal, to which the Creator gave a spiritual soul at some definite moment. However, even the evolution of man's body is a mere hypothesis which has not been confirmd by solid scientific arguments. A teacher who passes this judgment on the evolutionary theory cannot be accused of teaching religious doctrine, for her presentation of the case is simply a sound philosophical conclusion.

To be able to explain and to defend the truth in such cases as have been cited, the Catholic school teacher must necessarily possess an accurate and fairly extensive knowledge of the relevant theological, philosophical and historical data. She may have had the advantage of a good training in a Catholic college; but even if she did not enjoy this privilege she should devote herself to the private study of the subjects on which she is likely to be questioned. She should be especially familiar with the standard objections to Catholicism, and for this purpose such works as *The Question Box* by Fr. Bertrand Conway, C.S.P., and *Radio Replies* by Frs. Rumble and Carty are valuable sources of information. It should be noted that inquiries or objections to the Catholic religion may come not

only from the pupils but also from her fellow teachers, and she should be able to give these latter a scientific and adequate answer. If she encounters a difficulty that surpasses her own abilities, she should discuss it with a priest and receive the proper explanation.

The Catholic teacher should regard herself as responsible in some measure for the religious training of the Catholic children under her supervision. She may not fulfill this duty in class time, but she should take advantage of opportunities outside this period to give advice or admonition, when it is called for, if she deems it feasible. In 1929 the Bishops of England enunciated officially a principle that has an important bearing on the relation of the Catholic teacher toward Catholic children—the principle that the teacher is the delegate of the parents rather than of the government. The Bishops asserted: "A teacher never is and never can be a civil servant, and should never regard himself or allow himself to be so regarded. Whatever authority he may possess to teach and control children, and to claim their respect and obedience, comes to him from God through the parents and not through the State, except in so far as the State is acting on behalf of the parents."[6] From this it follows that the Catholic teacher can reasonably presume that Catholic parents depute to her some responsibility over the spiritual training of their children, since this is an essential factor of Catholic education.

Accordingly, the Catholic teacher should take some action if she discovers or suspects that a Catholic child is missing Mass or failing otherwise in his or her religious duties. There may be reason to believe that a boy or girl is sadly in need of religious instruction. The teacher need not give the admonition or instruction herself, but she should bring the case to the attention of a priest or the child's parents. Sometimes a teacher can give prudent advice to a pupil as to the selection of a college, or even as to the choice of a state of life. There are nuns in our country today who received their first inspiration to the religious life from a public school teacher who perceived in them the signs of a divine call. A Catholic teacher can exercise a genuine apostolate, if she earnestly seeks opportunities, without laying herself open to the charge of "sectarian propaganda." In fact, there are some instances of non-Catholic teachers who take a deep interest in the spiritual welfare of the

[6] Cf. Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology* (New York, 1938), II, 88.

Catholic children entrusted to their charge, even to the extent of encouraging likely candidates for the priesthood.

The "released time" program, now prevailing in some sections, whereby an hour of the regular class period is devoted weekly to religious instruction according to the particular denominational choice of the parents should receive wholehearted co-operation from Catholic teachers. Charity and zeal should prompt them to lend their assistance to their pastors, if it is requested. On the other hand, they should realize that "released time" is no adequate substitute for a complete Catholic education, since it presents religious training as a mere adjunct of the curriculum rather than as the vital principle of every phase of education. But it is certainly better than the complete disregard of religious instruction, and will contribute in some small measure toward rectifying the crass defect in the American system of public education.

As we stated above, the American system of education, though it excludes religious instruction, supposes some manner of ethical training. The teacher may not inculcate the supernatural virtues, nor expound the ideals of moral perfection as preached by Christ and interpreted by the Catholic Church. But she can avail herself of favorable opportunities to point out the beauty and the nobility of such natural virtues as truthfulness, justice, kindness, and temperance. Indeed, there would seem to be no infringement on the non-religious character of our public education if the teacher made reference to God as Creator, and man's obligation to adore and serve Him. So general an assertion of a truth that is demonstrable by natural reason would certainly not be classified as "sectarianism," the bugaboo of those who excluded religious teaching from our public schools.

The Catholic teacher must ever bear in mind that her own example can be a most effective inspiration to her pupils. If she desires to measure up to the ideals of her profession according to the standards of the Catholic Church she must ever be patient, kind, truthful, and above all, just. This last virtue is especially important, for children have a keen appreciation of justice, and conversely they deeply resent any manifestation of undue favoritism or prejudice on the part of their preceptors. This virtue must be manifest in the treatment not only of individuals but also of racial groups. In a school where white and colored children attend classes together, the teacher must be most careful not to exhibit any spirit of discrimina-

tion. She should also, in fact, when occasion offers, condemn all forms of racism, pointing out the unreasonableness of race prejudice, and extolling the basic Christian principle that all men are equal in the eyes of Almighty God. To discriminate against a child because of race or color would not only be a violation of genuine Americanism but would also be a sin against God's law, as proclaimed by the Catholic Church. The same principles apply to prejudice or favoritism in reference to different national or religious groups. And it should be noted that the Catholic teacher who conscientiously practices the virtues proper to the classroom is actually winning the esteem of her pupils for the Catholic Church, since they will esteem her conduct in connection with its religious background.

As was just said, the Catholic teacher must accord the non-Catholic pupils the same treatment she gives to those of her own faith. But this practise of distributive justice must not lapse into religious indifferentism. When so many of those charged with the care of young folks in our country today are striving to eliminate Catholic "exclusiveness," and are eagerly seeking occasions of proclaiming that it makes little or no difference what particular form of religion a person practises, Catholics must be especially emphatic in upholding the principle that there is only one true religion, imposed by God on all mankind, and that is Catholicism. Neither in the classroom nor in her associations with teachers of other creeds may the Catholic teacher use expressions savoring of indifferentism. She may, indeed, explain and uphold the American system granting equal rights to all religions, but in lauding this system she should make it clear that she is limiting her praise to our own country, because of particular conditions prevailing here, and that she has no intention of condemning other lands in which a different procedure prevails. She must not speak in such wise as to give the impression that all forms of religious belief possess a natural right to exist and to propagate. Only the true religion possesses such a natural right.

Sometimes a Catholic teacher is expected to attend religious services in a non-Catholic church. The occasion may be the wedding or funeral of one of her fellow teachers, and in such a case she would be permitted to attend. In some sections of our country, where Catholics are few in number, the graduation exercises may be held in a Protestant church in connection with a service, and if conditions are such that teachers and pupils are practically forced to

be present, they could attend the exercises. However, Catholics should be fully aware that they may not participate actively in any form of public non-Catholic religious worship. Their participation when it is justified—as in the instance just mentioned—must be limited to mere presence or passive assistance.

By a strange inconsistency, despite the principle that our public schools are non-religious, in some parts of our country custom or regulation calls for the reading of the Bible at the opening of class each morning. The Catholic teacher may find her classroom provided with a Protestant Bible, and she naturally wonders how she should act. Archbishop Kenrick, more than a century ago, forbade without any qualification the use of the Protestant scriptures by a Catholic teacher.[7] Fr. Konings, writing some thirty years later, ventured the opinion that if a Catholic teacher would otherwise have to suffer some great hardship (presumably the loss of her position or exclusion from promotion) she would be permitted to read from the Protestant Bible passages conformable to the Catholic version, provided she would not thus give the Catholic children the impression that she regarded the non-Catholic text as authoritative.[8] Considering conditions as they exist in our country today, I believe that the Catholic teacher, in the situation presented, should bring her own Bible to class and read it to the pupils. I do not think that any punitive measures would be attempted against her, even in pronouncedly non-Catholic communities. However, in the event that there would be such a manifestation of bigotry, she could follow the opinion rendered by Fr. Konings.

The recitation of the Our Father is also customary in some schools. Naturally the Protestant children add the phrase: "For thine is the kingdom," etc. These words should not be recited by the Catholic pupils or the Catholic teacher, although she could start the prayer and continue through the phrase: "Deliver us from evil." It is true, the added words contain no expression of heresy, and actually are employed by the Catholics of the Oriental rites in reciting the Lord's Prayer. But in practise these words are recognized among us as a distinctively Protestant formula, so that their use would constitute an implicit approval of heresy. On the other hand, the Catholic teacher need have no scruples about beginning

[7] *Theologia Moralis* (Philadelphia, 1842), Tr. 13, n. 62.

[8] *Theologia Moralis* (Boston, 1874), n. 437.

the prayer for the Protestant pupils, even though they are going to add the unauthorized phrase. Nowadays, when parents so generally neglect their obligation of teaching their children to pray, it is certainly better for them to become accustomed to the recitation of this formula in school than to grow up with the habit of not praying at all.

The subject of sex education in the public schools has been discussed widely in recent years. Many entirely misunderstand the attitude of the Catholic Church toward this matter, and accuse Catholic priests and educators of holding that it is the proper thing to allow children to grow up entirely ignorant of sex matters. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The authorities of the Catholic Church hold that proper sex training is an essential feature of a complete education. But they believe that it must be imparted in the right manner, otherwise it would do more harm than good. Since sex education is something personal and intimate, it should be given normally by the parents of the child, according to his individual needs and his physical or intellectual development. Since the needs and the development of children in this matter are by no means concomitant with their age level and school grade, it is impossible to designate a particular time in the curriculum when a group instruction is expedient. For some members of the class this would be too early, for some it would be too late. Furthermore, sex instruction should always be accompanied by incentives to the practise of chastity; and incentives to the angelic virtue, to be most effective, must be connected with definite religious instruction, such as could not be given in our public schools. Unfortunately, too, many of the public school teachers of our country do not uphold the high ideals of chastity preached by the Catholic Church. For these reasons bishops and priests are opposed to group sex instruction in our public schools.

However, when the curriculum of a public school requires sex instruction, the Catholic teacher should be better fitted to give it than are those of other denominations. Her explanations should be dignified and chaste, and not too detailed. Above all, she should emphasize the great difference between the instinctive use of the sex faculties by irrational animals and by human beings possessing intelligence and free will. She should point out very clearly that the lawful use of the sexual powers is restricted to married persons, and should suggest motives for purity, at least on the score of the

nobility and the strength of character manifested by those who practise this virtue. Since many children do not receive adequate training in sex matters from their parents, the teacher should not hesitate to give more personal instruction privately to any girl who may take her into her confidence. Such an occasion might afford the opportunity of warning an unsuspecting child against dangerous associations. In similar circumstances a male teacher could give suitable instruction to a boy who seeks his counsel. Needless to say, great prudence should be employed in cases of this nature lest the well-meaning action of the teacher be interpreted as a manifestation of prurience or even perversion.

In certain sections of our country a Catholic finds it difficult to obtain a position in the public schools because of the spirit of bigotry and hatred of the Catholic Church. This should not deter Catholics from aspiring to such positions and winning appointments by outstanding merit. However, they must remember that no compromise in matters of faith is ever permissible, no matter how great the advantage to be gained thereby. And when a Catholic does succeed in obtaining the desired position in such localities, she should make a special effort to break down the prejudice by proving her pedagogical ability and her moral worth. On the other hand, a Catholic teacher, frustrated in her attempts at promotion, must not be too ready to attribute her failure to bigotry. Doubtless there are Catholic teachers who feel they have been wronged, whereas in reality their lack of advancement was due to their failure to check and to meet eligibility requirements, to prepare thoroughly for examinations, and to work competently and industriously in the classroom.

The priest who has a group of public school teachers in his parish has a splendid opportunity of aiding them both personally and professionally. He can provide them with literature that will enlarge their knowledge of religion. He can organize them into a study club that will meet regularly to discuss problems pertinent to their work in school. Above all he can and should inspire them to conduct themselves as loyal and apostolic members of the Catholic Church so that they inspire others to seek and to find the divine truth proclaimed for the entire human race by Him who is the first Teacher of all mankind.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

RUSSIA AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Aside from the political and military dispatches that have been pouring out of Russia, the mysterious land of the Soviets, a number of interesting news items dealing with Russia's future attitude towards the Catholic Church have also made their appearance and provoked various comments. Several months ago Serge, the late Patriarch of Moscow, allegedly wrote an article in which he denounced the supreme authority of the Pope, and stated that the Russian Orthodox church could never accept the Catholic teaching concerning the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. Shortly thereafter, our Holy Father Pope Pius XII wrote an Encyclical *Orientalis Ecclesiae decus,* commemorating the fifteen hundredth anniversary of the death of St. Cyril of Alexandria, and once more urged the separated Eastern churches to return to the faith of the great champion of the true faith. In answer to this appeal a Serbian Orthodox priest in New York City, who claims to enjoy considerable influence in Orthodox circles, flatly stated that henceforth Christianity will look towards Moscow for inspiration and leadership. This was followed by statements of others who claimed that Stalin was favorably inclined towards the Catholic Church.

As a result of these conflicting statements, Catholics have been wondering about the possibilities of reunion of the Dissidents with the true Church, and, although the number of reunion enthusiasts is growing, one can sense a certain feeling of frustration because of the lack of encouragement on the part of the Dissidents.

This feeling of frustration is most probably due to the fact that the average American Catholic recives most of his information from quarters inimical towards the Holy See, and what he does not realize is that these sources are not as authoritative as they pretend to be. Furthermore, few seem to realize that today we find a group of Russians, many of whom are Catholics and many more of whom are openly sympathetic towards the Catholic Church, who are hard at work in the interest of the cause of reunion.

This small group, which is fully aware of the difficulties that surround the problem of reunion, is animated by the universally acknowledged optimism and confidence in the final success of reunion so inherent to the works and apostolate of the "Russian

Newman"—Vladimir S. Soloviev.[1] And since Vladimir S. Soloviev is looked upon by both Catholic and non-Catholic Russians as one of their greatest leaders, it would be of interest, perhaps, to know the opinion of this great philosopher as to the possibility of reunion.

THE SOLVIEV MEMORANDUM

The memorandum which we give here in the English translation was originally written in French and was published in St. Petersburg, together with some other letters of Soloviev, by E. L. Radlov in 1908.[2]

According to a notation made by Mr. Radlov this memorandum was written by Soloviev on Sept. 21, 1886. Upon its receipt Bishop Strossmeyer[3] had the memorandum printed in ten copies only. One copy each was sent to the Nuncio in Vienna, to the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Rampolla, and to Pope Leo XIII. It is said that some time later Soloviev was given an oppor-

[1] For a brief English biography and description of his works see Dom Theodore Wesseling, "Vladimir Soloviev," *The Eastern Churches Quarterly,* II, 1, 2 (1937). Also Thomas Gerrard, "The Russian Newman," *The Catholic World,* CV, 6 (June, 1917).

[2] E. L. Radlov, *Pis'ma Vladimira Sergieievitcha Soloviev* (St. Petersburg, 1908), I, str. 183-90.

[3] "Mgr. Strossmayer, Bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium (Slavonia), was the chief fighting member of the Minority and the storm-centre of most of the 'scenes' of the Vatican Council. . . . Of German race, but of a family long domiciled in Croatia, he was by birth and sympathy a Croat and a panslavist, one of the chief pioneers of the South Slavonic movement that has finally issued in the formation of Yugo-Slavia. The late Dr. Adrian Fortescue has given a discriminating but sympathetic account of Strossmayer in the *Dublin Review* (October, 1918) well worth reading. His diocese, including Bosnia, Dalmatia, with Servia as a vicariate, was in 1870 partly in the Austrian Empire and partly in the Turkish. Thus, though of the Latin Church and the Latin rite, he lived in close contact with churches of Oriental rites, both Orthodox and Uniat; and one of the dominating ideas of his life was to conciliate the Slav Orthodox communions, especially Russia, and reunite them with the Catholic Church. This explains the vehemence of his opposition to the infallibility, in which he saw a fresh barrier to such hopes. He was by universal consent the outstanding Latin orator of the Council. . . . He was a friend of Leo XIII, who wanted to make him Archbishop of Zagreb (Agram) and Cardinal; but the Austrian Government objected on account of his Slav propaganda." Dom Cuthbert Butler, *The Vatican Council* (London, 1936), I, 134-35.

tunity to meet the great Pontiff and personally discuss the problems and possibilities of reunion. The memorandum reads as follows: "His Excellency:

Msgr. I. G. Strossmayer, Bishop of Bosnia and Smirnium, Vicar Apostolic of Serbia, Councillor of State to His Imperial Majesty, etc.

Monsignor,

"Providence, the will of the Sovereign Pontiff and your own virtues have made of you a real mediator between the Holy See, which by divine right is in possession of the keys to the future destinies of the world, and the Slavonic race, which in all probability is called to realize these destinies. Not content with having contributed exceedingly towards the resurrection of the Croats, your own illustrious nation, not content with being the living safeguard of its independence, you have taken to heart the superior interests of other Slavonic peoples, the majority of which, led by Russia, are still kept in a deplorable estrangement from the great Catholic unity. You have opened your heart to the Orient, rich in future, and your luminous intelligence made you perceive that the principle obstacle in the attainment of this future consists in the millenarian misunderstanding which continues to isolate and to deprive of mutual support the two great halves of the Christian world. Leaning upon the immovable Rock of the Church, protected and encouraged by the benevolent wisdom of the great Roman Pontiff (who, according to an ancient prophecy is distinguished in the series of Popes by the mystical surname "Lumen de coelo"), you have used your genius and your admirable eloquence in the service of the divine cause of reunion of Churches.

"Giving thanks to God for having raised such a defender in this cause I take the liberty, Monsignor, to address to you a few observations touching on the circumstances which favor the solution of the great problem which at present preoccupies you, and ask that you use this small memorandum as you see best fit.

"The Oriental Church never determined and never presented to the belief of the faithful *as an obligatory dogma* any doctrine contrary to the Catholic truth. The dogmatic decisions of the first seven ecumenical councils[4] represent the sum total of absolutely

[4] The Greek and Russian Orthodox Churches recognize only the first seven ecumenical councils and hold that all dogmatic definitions of subsequent councils convoked and sanctioned by the Holy See are bereft of divine authority.

indubitable and unchangeable doctrinal truths, recognized as such at all times and universally by the Oriental Church in its entirety. Anything that goes beyond these limits is subject to controversy [among the Orthodox—transl.] and can be considered as a particular doctrine of a certain theological school, or of an individual theologian of greater or lesser repute, which never received the sanction of the authority of an infallible magisterium.

"The acts of some particular councils (held after the separation of the Churches) and certain catechisms (such as that of Peter Moghila of Kiev or that of Philaret of Moscow),[5] notwithstanding the reputation they may enjoy, never received the supreme and definitive sanction of the Orthodox Church which could not transform their doctrines into articles of faith unless they made use of the infallibility of an ecumenical council which the Orthodox Church could not assemble because of her present isolation. Thus it is that our Church [the Orthodox—transl.] is not in possession of any symbolic book, taken in the sense as this term is used by Catholics or Protestants. Some forty years ago, a German Protestant published, under the title *Libri symbolici Ecclesiae orientalis* (later this title was changed to read *Monumenta fidei Ecclesiae orientalis*),[6] a collection of documents of different periods and of different merit, and among others one document definitely heretical generally recognized as such by us (the "Oriental Confession" Ἀνατολικὴ ὁμολόγησις by Patriarch Cyril Lucaris, well known for his Calvinistic sympathies).[7]

[5] Peter Moghila, Metropolitan of Kiev, compiled a catechism which was first published in the Greek language in Amsterdam in 1667. It was later translated into the Russian language and was published in 1696 under the title *Orthodox Confession of Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church.* Prior to the publishing of Moghila's catechism a certain Laurentius Tustanovskii compiled a similar catechism in 1627. This catechism was corrected and published in Moscow by the Patriarch Philaret. However, this catechism was not distributed because the Moscovite theologians took exception to several doctrinal statements.

[6] E. J. Kimmel-Weissenborn, *Monumenta fidei Ecclesiae orientalis,* II (Iena, 1851). For a full discussion of the merits of these symbolic books see M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum orientalium* (Paris, 1926), I, 671-82.

[7] Cyril Lucaris was born on the island of Crete in 1572, and studied at Padua and Venice. In 1601 he was made Patriarch of Alexandria, and in 1612-38 occupied the patriarchal throne of Constantinople on seven different

"This collection of M. Kimmel evidently does not possess any semblance of ecclesiastical authority and is known only to our specialists. Shortly after its publication our government published a code of ecclesiastical laws (in the Greek, Old Slavonic and modern Russian languages) under the title "Book of rules" (*Kniga Pravil*), which, together with the disciplinary canons of the Apostles, councils and several Fathers, venerated by the Universal Church, contains also the truths of the Orthodox faith, i.e., those which were formulated in the two symbols (of Nicea and Constantinople) and in the three definitions of the fourth, sixth and seventh ecumenical councils. It is evident that this official code of our Church does not contain any error, or any anti-Catholic element.[8]

"It is an established fact that the opinions of our Oriental theologians which are more or less contrary to the Catholic truth in general are not proclaimed as *infallible or obligatory dogmas* by these theologians themselves, nor are they accepted as such by the faithful, nor do they have the same value as the decisions of the ecumenical councils; consequently it is quite evident that one cannot justly place the responsibility for the anti-Catholic teachings of our theologians on the Oriental Church as a body, since she never gave these doctrines her definitive sanction.

"The distinction which is made between a doctrine of a certain theological school and the doctrine of a Church to which that school may belong is applicable, to a certain extent, to Catholicism as well. To quote but one instance, it is known to all that for centuries the great theological school of the Thomists, and the great Dominican

---

occasions. On orders of the Sultan he was strangled to death in 1638. He corresponded with a number of Protestant friends and as a result tried to introduce the Calvinistic doctrine into the Greek Orthodox Church. In 1629 he published a catechism in the Latin language. In 1633 he re-edited this same catechism in the Latin and Greek languages. These erroneous teachings of Cyril were vehemently condemned by decree of a Synod held in Constantinople, which was promulgated on Sept. 24, 1638. This condemnation was again reiterated by a synodal decree of a synod held by Patriarch Parthenius I (1639-44) in May of 1642.

[8] In the codes of religious laws which retained their binding force up to the beginning of the present century (the so-called *Kormcaja Kniga*—"Rudder Book") there were many absurd fables inspired by Byzantine hatred for Catholicism. Because of these fables, our government found it opportune to prohibit the ecclesiastical use of these ancient *Kormcija* and replaced them with the new "Book of rules." (Author's note.)

Order attacked or at least refused to recognize the sublime truth of the Immaculate Conception of the Most Holy Virgin, maintaining that she also was tainted with original sin. But who would have the audacity to blame the Catholic Church for this error of otherwise highly respected theologians who, in this particular instance, gave expression to their personal opinions?

"It is clear, therefore, that this distinction between the doctrine of the Church as such, and the doctrine of a school or individual theologians is most helpful in the cause of reunion of Churches. As a matter of fact *the dogmas of our Church* can be reduced to the decisions of the ecumenical councils, and consequently *are in fact orthodox and Catholic,* and the doctrines of theologians which contradict Catholicism are not dogmas of faith determined by the Church. And thus we are united with Catholicism, because we ourselves recognize these truths as absolute and unchangeable, while the errors which separate us from Catholic unity are nothing but opinions reft of all superior authority, as the authors and abettors of these opinions will readily acknowledge.

"As for the masses of the faithful of the Oriental Church, one cannot accuse them of any definite error, being that their faith is the same as the Catholic faith save for the ignorance of a few doctrinal definitions principally concerned with the true character and the attributes of the supreme power in the Church determined in the West after the separation was accomplished; an ignorance which can be more easily excused since this chapter of Catholic doctrine was not definitively fixed and was not definitely explained by the Western Church herself till very recent times, i.e., till the last council held at the Vatican.

"On the other hand, one must not forget, and this is a very grave and advantageous circumstance for the cause of reunion, that in regard to the relationship towards the Catholic Church, within the Oriental Church there is no internal accord, no unity of thought. Since the separation of the Churches no ecumenical councils were celebrated in the East (and, according to the opinion of our better theologians, none can be celebrated), the causes leading to separation were never judged by a competent authority, which would be recognized as such; thus it is that our schism exists only *de facto,* but by no means *de jure. Adhuc sub judice lis est.*[9]

[9] At the Council of Florence, as is well known, Isidore—the Metropolitan

"In view of this state of affairs, one should not wonder at the extreme variety of diverse and contradictory opinions professed by the Russian and Greek theologians in regards to Catholicism. While there were some writers (fortunately few in number) averring that Catholicism not only strayed from the true Church, but in general betrayed Christianity as well, other personages more authoritative and more competent (as for instance the present Metoropolitan of Kiev, the venerable Msgr. Platno) publicly declared that the Eastern and Western Churches were twin sisters separated only by a misunderstanding.[10]

"Between these two extreme views one will find, in our theological literature, all possible nuances of positive and negative views, views of sympathy and antipathy in regards to the Western Church.[11]

"Aside from these differences of opinion among the individual theologians, there is also a great contrast in the manner in which the Catholics are treated by the Russian Church and by the Greek (Hellenic) Church. While the Greeks, as if to mock their own

---

of All Russia, acceded to a union with Rome. Upon his return to Moscow (the capitol of both Russian state and Church), speaking in his Cathedral Church dedicated to the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, he made known his submission to the Pope. The *boyari* and the people, according to the account of a chronicler, listened to this proclamation in silence. Only the Grand Duke Basil spoke, declaring that he would never agree to the union with Rome, and Isidore fled to Italy where he died as a Cardinal of the Roman Church. Several years later the nephews of the Grand Duke rebelled against him, imprisoned him and gouged his eyes. Restored to the throne, the people surnamed him "the Obscure" (Vassili Temny), by which name he is also known to history. (Author's note.)

[10] A discourse to this effect was made by Msgr. Platon in 1884, in a Catholic Church situated within the limits of his diocese. The great masses of faithful of both denominations showed great joy in hearing these words of peace and charity dictated by the Christian sentiments of this octogenerian Pontiff. The anti-Christian elements in Russia and Poland were greatly disturbed by these pronouncements and used every possible means to neutralize the beneficient effects of this incident. (Author's note.)

[11] Further evidence of the undecided position our Church finds itself in with regard to Catholicism lies in the fact that a large number of individuals believe that the "new" Catholic dogmas represent the legitimate development of orthodox doctrine, and consequently that one believing in them may still remain in perfect communion with the Eastern Church. I can testify to this from my own personal experience. (Author's note.)

attempts at reunion, still maintain the absurd and sacrilegious custom according to which they rebaptize all Western Christians who desire to affiliate themselves with their [Orthodox—transl.] Church (making no distinction between Catholics and Protestants), in Russia on the contrary not only is baptism of all Western Christians recognized as valid, but insofar as the Catholic Church is concerned, we [Orthodox—transl.] also recognize the validity of the other sacraments administered by Catholics, and particularly the Sacrament of Holy Orders, and consequently when Catholic bishops and priests are received into our Church they are allowed to retain their ecclesiastical dignity. And what is more remarkable, when in 1839, the reunited Ruthenians were forced to join the dominating Church of Russia, *the people* were not requested to abjure their Catholic beliefs.[12]

"In view of these facts we feel safe in concluding that the Russian Church not only recognizes the efficacy of grace in the Catholic Church, but also recognizes the absence of any dogmatic error or heresy in the Catholic teaching. And if at the same time one finds in Russia a group of so-called Orthodox writers, recognized as such by a certain group of the clergy, which revives the ancient injuries of heretics declaring that Catholicism is nothing else than anti-Christianism, etc., this represents but one other instance in a long series of contradictions which in the long run will be of great advantage to the cause of reunion. In fact these contradictions, once they are recognized, will necessarily provoke an interior *stimulus* which will force us [Orthodox—transl.] to bring the question into full light in an endeavor to solve it. Once public attention, in all seriousness, will have been called to the abnormal state of our religious and ecclesiastical affairs, something definite will have to be done. And because it is quite certain that in this matter one will find more ignorance than bad will, in order that a solution *in principle* be reached it will suffice to clarify the problem in the pure light of truth and scholarship.

"As for the practical solution of the problem, there is one favor-

[12] Reference is made here to the sad occurrences which followed the three partitions of Poland. With each successive partition Russia managed to receive a large portion of Catholics who adhered to the Byzantine-Slavonic rite, and since these Catholics were outlawed in the old Russian Empire, millions of Catholics were forced to adhere to the official Russian Orthodox Church.

able circumstance to consider, namely that the Oriental Church, and in particular the Russian Church, never did belong to the Western Patriarchate, and thus the uniform centralisation of ecclesiastical power, as developed in the limits of the Latin Church, in its entirety cannot be imposed in our midst. The present constitution of the Catholic Church to a certain extent has been determined by the deplorable Eastern schism which for centuries limited Catholic activities to the Latin Patriarchate exclusively, in which the Universal Church had to gain in unity what it had lost in extension. *Sed pereunte causa tollitur effectus.* Once ancient unity is re-established, the Catholic Church, remaining *forever Roman* because of her center of unity, will no longer be entirely Latin and Western as it is now because of uniformity in organization and administration (notwithstanding the tolerance of other rites which actually play but a secondary part). *Romana* is the name of the center which is equally and unchangeably the center of the whole circumference; *Latina,* designates but one-half, one great section of the circle which should never definitively absorb the whole. It is the Church of Rome, not the Latin Church, that is the *Mater et magistra omnium Ecclesiarum;* it is the Bishop of Rome, not the Patriarch of the West, who speaks infallibly *ex cathedra;* and it should not be forgotten that at one time the Bishop of Rome spoke in the Greek language.

"In our midst one will find a number of people who desire unity, but they fear latinization. It is necessary, therefore, to assure them that if the Oriental Church will return to Catholic unity, if she will recognize in the Holy See the power granted and willed to it by Our Lord in the person of St. Peter in order that unity, solidarity and the legitimate progress of Christianity might be safeguarded, she (the Oriental Church) will conserve not only her rite (which is understood), but also the autonomy of organization and administration as exercised in the East prior to the separation of the Churches. To mention but one particular point, the superior position of the orthodox Emperor recognized at all times by the Eastern Church (and now recognized in Russia), must remain intact.

"To summarize all that was said before, the essential basis for the reunion of Churches is determined by two distinctions:

"(1) The distinction between particular opinions of our theologians, which can be erroneous, anti-Catholic and heretical, and

between the faith of the Oriental Church in its totality, which continues to remain orthodox and Catholic.

"(2) The distinction between the authority of the Pope as successor to St. Peter the *Pastor et Magister Infallibilis Ecclesiae Universalis,* and between his administrative powers as Patriarch of the West, a distinction which will guarantee the autonomy of the Eastern Church without which, humanly speaking, reunion will be impossible.

"I need not insist upon this point. I have unlimited confidence in the traditional (and divinely assisted) wisdom of the Roman Church and in the superior intelligence and in the particular virtues of the present great Pontiff. It is not a question of defending our rights, but rather a question of accepting his paternal love.

"Furthermore, the reunion of Churches will prove equally profitable for both parties. Rome will gain a pious and religiously enthusiastic people, she will have gained a powerful and faithful defender. Russia, which in accordance with the Will of God holds the destinies of the East, will not only have freed herself of the sin of involuntary schism, but will *eo ipso* become free to accomplish her great universal vocation, i.e., she will reunite all the Slav nations and will establish a new civilization truly Christian, reuniting the characteristics of the one truth and the multiform freedom in the supreme principle of charity, which embraces all in unity and distributes to all the plenitude of the unique good.

"And when I submit to Your Excellency these few reflections upon a subject so dear to your heart, I beg of you to accept the assurance of my sentiments of deepest veneration and admiration, and always remain Your Excellency's most devout son and servant,

Dr. Vladimir Soloviev."

COMMENTARY

The standard text books used in our seminaries generally speak of five differences that separate the Catholic Church and the Dissidents, and aver that the Dissident group firmly believes that:

(1) The Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father and the Son.

(2) The Transubstantiation is not completed with the utterance of the words of Institution, but finally takes place after the recital of the Epiclesis.

(3) Purgatory does not exist.

(4) The Blessed Virgin Mary was not conceived without original sin.

(5) The Pope is not the visible head of the Church, but enjoys only an honorary primacy.

As for the procession of the Holy Spirit, there is little we can add to what has been said by qualified theologians. The fact, however, remains that this matter is so subtle we doubt very much whether the Dissident faithful are aware of any doctrinal difference between the two Churches.

No theologian or member of the hierarchy, much less the faithful, would dare to deny the obligation of adoring the Sacred Species if for some reason the celebrant would interrupt the Liturgy after he had uttered the words of Institution and before the utterance of the Epiclesis.

The Byzantine Calendar dedicates five Saturdays in the year to the commemoration of the dead;[13] the various rituals for burials and the Office for the Dead would make no sense without the acceptance of the existence of Purgatory. As a matter of fact, till this day the Dissident faithful, encouraged by the Liturgy, custom and ecclesiastical law, continue to offer suffrages and Masses for the repose of the soul of the deceased.

It would be impossible to number the instances in which the Byzantine Liturgy refers to and extols the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Mother. It is a well established and universally recognized fact that the feast of the Immaculate Conception made its first appearance in the Byzantine Patriarchate in the eighth century, long before it was introduced into the West. Till this day one will find, in the Dissident liturgical books, Dec. 9 designated as a first class feast under the title "Conception of Anna."[14] Furthermore, the aforementioned Peter Moghila, Metropolitan of Kiev, organized a Sodality with the avowed purpose of spreading the knowl-

[13] Universal commemoration of the dead (somewhat similar to the Roman All Souls Day) is prescribed by the Byzantine ritual for the following days: Saturday before the so-called Sunday of Meat-fare (second Sunday before the beginning of Lent), second, third, and fourth Saturdays during Lent, and Saturday before Pentecost Sunday.

[14] "Festivitas heac Graecorum antiquissima est, et ex illa orta est Latina festivitas 8 Decembri, Ratio, quare ecclesia Graeca semper diem 9 pro mysterio recolendo habuerit, cum nativitatem deiparae econtra 8 septembri celebret, obscura remanet. In Dominica conceptione et nativitate servantur etiam ab ecclesia Graeca 25 martii et 25 decembris, in conceptione et nativi-

edge and veneration of the Immaculate Conception. This movement, which started long before the author of the famous Encyclical *Ineffabilis Deus* was born, soon spread throughout the Russian Empire and enjoyed great popularity.[15]

As for the primacy of the Pope, one can always depend on the Byzantine Liturgy for unequivocal support, although it is true that the vast majority of the Dissident faithful came to look upon the Roman Pontiff as the Anti-Christ. But if one considers the anti-Catholic propaganda that has been on foot for centuries among these peoples, one can readily understand how they came to take this attitude. The most important fact, however, remains that never did the Dissident church as such condemn the Primacy of the Pope, despite the fact that it was the core of all controversy of many centuries.

The claim of Dr. Soloviev is justifiable when he holds that these erroneous statements are not taken from the official teachings of the Dissident church and merely represent the private opinion of theologians and members of the Dissident hierarchy. This claim is supported by the tradition as well as present-day customs and liturgies of the separated Eastern groups.

When all is considered, one does find reason for hope that the Dissident church, admitting so much of the Catholic doctrine, will one day, in God's mercy, find its way back to the true Church of Jesus Christ.

STEPHEN C. GULOVICH

Munhall, Pa.

---

tate praecursoris 23 septembris et 24 junii (vide observationem factum supra, pag. 130). Debet ergo illa circumstantia temporis cum quadam re narrata ab antiqua traditione nobis nunc incognita cohaerere, nisi forsitan mere casu aut per errorem dies 9 in usum venit." See Maximilanus, *Praelectiones de liturgiis orientalibus* (Frieburg-im-Breisgau, 1908), p. 155. The observation referred to on p. 130 reads as follows: "23 Septembri Celebratur antiquissima festivitas conceptionis Sti. Joannis praecursoris. . . . Celebratur imprimis annunciatio in templo per angelum nativitatis praecursoris. Ex hac forsan ratione observatur festum istud plus quam novem menses ante nativitatem, quia conceptio aliquot diebus post annuntiationem locum habuit, cum Zacharias post dies ministerii sui reversus est domum et cognovit uxorem suam."

[15] For further details on this matter cfr. M. Jugie, "De conceptione immaculata B. Mariae Virginis apud Russos, saeculo XVII," *Acta academiae Velehradensis*, annus VII, I-II, 3-15; IV, 180-85.

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING

The literature dealing with problems of guidance and counselling, the number of courses preparing for such activities, and the appointments of specifically trained persons in high schools, colleges, industries, and institutions of all sorts, are steadily growing. Textbooks and monographic studies, numerous articles and journals specially devoted to this set of questions, all give testimony of a lively interest. The number of persons seeking advice at agencies set up for the sake of counselling, and the number of interviews held in these agencies, show that there is a definite need for such service on the part of the public.

The problem of counselling, therefore, is very important at this time. It deserves careful consideration because counselling, expressly recognized as such or implicitly carried out together with other activities, is part of many institutions. Whoever has to do with the management of schools is faced with the problem of student-counselling. Social work of all types frequently involves the necessity of advising and guiding.

Viewed from a theoretical angle, guidance and counselling are special aspects of the various endeavors to form human personality. The problems are closely related to those of education, especially of "adult education," or at least, education of individuals already at the close of the educational age properly so called, as is the case with college students of the junior and senior classes. On the other hand, these questions border on and intermingle with those of psychopathology, since a great number of the cases seeking and needing advice, and perhaps something more than mere advice, are involved in difficulties the roots of which have to be sought in some distortion or warping of their personalities.

Since counselling is, necessarily, more or less educational in character, it affects the total personality. It is only in relatively rare cases that the individual needs special advice concerning merely one definite point. Usually, it is the whole personality which is involved, even though it may not become explicitly the topic of any discussion or counselling. But if it is involved it will also be affected, whether explicitly discussed or not.

Concerning education there are, as one well knows, two opposite viewpoints. One is called, by those who adopt it, "modern" and "progressive"; they consider it to be in agreement with the "scientific" mentality, and therefore the only one which can be adequate to the task of developing personality. According to this school, no absolute ends of education can be recognized. The ends have to change with the times so as to equip the individual for the "pursuit of happiness" under the actually existing conditions, and, probably, also to make him capable of readjusting himself to any change in these conditions which might occur during his life. The other viewpoint holds that, all changes of conditions of life notwithstanding, there are certain immutable ends, determined by man's fundamentally unchangeable nature. This school agrees with the "progressive" insofar as it too maintains that it is man's task and right to unfold his personality as much as possible, that he has to be equipped by education for this task, and so on. Instead, however, of limiting the preparation for life, and eventually, the guidance in case of difficulties, to the merely formal or functional aspect, this second school emphasizes the need of postively formulated principles, material contents. This emphasis does not result, as many of the adversaries erroneously allege, from the desire of fashioning human nature according to a preconceived and "unnatural" ideal, but from the conviction that these principles express in the most perfect manner the very essence of human nature. It is obvious that in regard to the problems of guidance and counselling, also, the opposition between the two schools becomes manifest and basically influences the ideas of task and method.

The knowledge, however, of such a basic opposition of viewpoints does not justify the attitude not unfrequently assumed, that everything said on the part of the opposition has to be, unavoidably and *a priori*, wrong. Quite to the contrary, the certainty of possessing the truth to a greater extent is no guarantee for infallibility in details nor of faultlessness in the practical application of the general principles; rather, such a belief becomes easily the source of mistakes, sometimes of a serious character. The certainty concerning the content of the principles is confused by many with the knowledge of the practical situations in which these principles apply. It is always worth while to examine the ideas proposed and the experiments made by the other side.

Questions may thus become apparent which hitherto had been overlooked, and methods be suggested whose existence and usefulness had been ignored.

There is, of course, also the danger of going too far in the other direction. Catholic schools repeatedly have adopted methods and educational ideas alien to their own principles, simply because these ideas and methods were "modern" or "scientific," and tried to solder them on the body of their own tradition. In the attempt to achieve such a halfhearted compromise, the true nature of the newly adopted measures has often been misunderstood. This is, to a noticeable extent, true also of guidance and counselling, both in the field of social work and, especially, in that of student counselling.

The main difficulty, for the Catholic administrator of schools or director of a social agency, lies precisely in finding a *just mean* between the purely authoritative explanation and, if possible, enforcement of the objective law on one hand, and on the other hand, the taking account of individual particularities, of all that which is comprised under the headings of "development of personality" and "self-expression."

According to the Catholic view, the objective law sets an absolute limit to "self-expression." If the objective law collides with personal desires so as to constitute a "frustration," the conflict cannot be resolved by removing the obstacle, but only by enabling the individual to conform to the immovable objective conditions. This does not, however, amount to a fundamental difference between guidance or counselling as envisioned by the Catholic and the same endeavors as seen by the non-Catholic. The difference is, in fact, only one of degree. A certain number of objective rules have to be recognized under all circumstances. "Self-expression" can never go so far as to permit ignoring of objective laws. It does not make any difference for the individual—although it does make all the difference in the world in theory—whether the objective law be considered as essentially immutable and therefore identical at all times, or whether it be only recognized as valid for the time being. It is not much of a comfort to an individual resenting the restrictions imposed by law and feeling "frustrated" by them, if he is told that these restrictions are remnants of a world already passing away and that future generations will not be frustrated in the same manner.

His personal feelings are independent of the better fate of future generations. *He*, here and now, *is* subject to the law, whether it be eternal or historical. So in principle, even the most "progressive" attitude in counselling and personality development cannot help recognizing the necessity of obedience. In any case, the individual has to be led to the acknowledgement that there are objective, or, if one prefers, trans-subjective, powers, and that the individual can fill his natural place in society and achieve a modicum of personal satisfaction only by complying with these objective powers.

The more students of personality realize that a human being cannot be understood nor his behavior directed unless he is contemplated within the total setting of his life, the greater the emphasis on the "objective" aspect becomes. As soon as the fact is fully grasped that the individual is not only set over against his environment (taking this word in the broadest sense) but is part of this environment, that the rules governing the surrounding world are also those which determine the individual's nature, and that therefore, an individual refusing recognition to the objective law also refuses recognition to his own nature and thus works towards self-destruction,—as soon as these fundamental traits of every human situation are fully realized, any purely subjectivistic attitude in education or counselling becomes impossible. One notices, accordingly, a definite trend towards "objectivism" in some of the recent studies on problems of this kind.

Rational and intentional recognition of the objective law on the part of the individual is not yet tantamount to acceptance of the law in the sense that to obey it would become "natural." One probably wrongs Socrates by presenting his famous doctrine that "virtue is knowledge" as if he had intended to say that mere intellectual recognition suffices for moral behavior. The "knowledge" of which he spoke is of a higher kind and of more far-reaching efficacy than mere intellectual knowledge ever is. But whatever the true Socratic interpretation may be, it is certain that without knowledge of "The Good" moral behavior cannot develop. All conceptions of human nature and of man's place in the order of being which emphasize the objective law and man's obligation in regard to this law have justly considered instruction as the *conditio sine qua non* of any attempt at establish-

ing moral behavior or helping the individual adjust himself to objective reality.

In some cases, attainment of a more correct knowledge is alone sufficient to eliminate certain difficulties. Problems which appeared most serious may vanish because they are revealed as pseudo-problems springing from an erroneous interpretation of reality. Adolescents often believe that certain of their problems are absolutely unique, that they alone are afflicted with difficulties of this type; they feel therefore, especially if the problems appear too big for evasion and too complex for solution, that they are different from the average, to their disadvantage, and may develop all sorts of undesirable traits and get entangled in all sorts of social, scholastic and other difficulties. They suffer under a growing sentiment of self-contempt, the reaction against which may take on very unpleasant forms. If, by chance, they discover that there are others in the same plight, it does not bring comfort to them; the only effect is that they extend the contempt they feel for themselves to these others. But whereas self-contempt is carefully hidden, contempt for others may be freely expressed. The mere realization that they are not alone with their fate is not enough to make them envision themselves from a different angle. This change of viewpoint can be achieved only if they can be made to see not only that there are others in the same situation, but also, and chiefly, that this situation is one natural to man and that to acknowledge the objective law is in no way derogatory to their personality and dignity.

The demonstration of such universal truths, however, is not effective if it proceeds simply by "laying down the law." Whereas it is true, on one hand, that the counsellor ought to enjoy a certain authority, the authoritative promulgation of the law remains usually ineffective. It is here, so far as I can see, that the most frequent and the most consequential mistakes in the arrangement and the technique of counselling are made, both in the fields of social work and of student counselling.

Nor is it always helpful that the individual seeking advice be given an explanation of his problems and difficulties. However true the explanation be, it has no beneficient effects if it cannot be fully accepted. Acceptance based only on the authority of the counsellor has as little influence on the total personality of the

individual and on his behavior as has the merely intellectual recognition of truth.

The most effective procedure will prove to be one by which the individual is enabled to discover the true nature of his problems himself and to work out the solution gradually. The counsellor, in such cases, ought to limit his activity to supplying the opportunity for such clarification and helping by occasional questions, suggestions, and comments.[1] This process of self-discovery and reorientation demands, if it is to evolve in a satisfactory manner, that certain conditions be fulfilled.

One of the most important conditions seems to be that the *counsellor must not, in any way, be the representative of disciplinarian authority* or be implicated in the process of discipline. This demands some explanation.

The counsellor ought not to be, at the same time, the person on whom the fate of the counselled individual depends. For instance, in social work the counsellor should not be the one on whose decision the grant of relief or assistance depends. In a scholastic institution, the counsellor ought to be separated from the scholastic authorities, so that what the student might say in the interviews may have no chance of eventually influencing his status within the institution. The interviews between the one counselled and the counsellor ought to stand strictly under the principle of private confidential affairs; the matters divulged and discussed during these interviews must be treated as a secret trust, and the counsellor ought to consider himself bound by the duty of professional secrecy, just as any physician is. The counsellor ought to be, so to speak, an outsider in regard to the regular organization of authority and disciplinary power.

For this separation of counselling and authority there are several reasons. The least important is, perhaps, that the

[1] The difference between a "directive" and a "non-directive" procedure in counselling is particularly emphasized by C. R. Rogers, Professor of Clinical Psychology at Ohio State University, in his excellent work *Counselling and Psychotherapy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1942). I agree on the whole with many of the viewpoints proposed by Dr. Rogers although I do not believe that his method will prove sufficient when one has to deal with truly severe cases of neurosis, e.g. of the compulsory type. Then, of course, his conception of non-directive procedure apparently disregards the necessity of having the counselled individual recognize the objective law and of avoiding any appearance of compromise in this regard.

counsellor himself, when he is also a representative of authority, may not be able to hold apart his two functions. Not only should the disciplinarian not know what the counsellor finds out, but also the latter should not be misled, by his interest in maintaining discipline, into making use of means of which he disposes in his other capacity. The difficulties created on the part of the one counselled are greater. He cannot help feeling that the two functions, on the one hand, that of authority, working in the interest of discipline (and thus of the institution or society), and, on the other hand, that of the counsellor, considering exclusively the interest of the individual, cannot be separated in fact. He cannot forget that he speaks to the representative of authority and accordingly he feels handicapped in his expression. He may not be consciously aware of any inhibition; he may be quite convinced that the counsellor is going to act only as such and to shelve, as it were, for the time being at least, his other side. Nonetheless, this knowledge will exercise a strong inhibitory power. A student, for instance, may have had the impression that he spoke quite freely and trustingly to some "official" counsellor—for instance, the dean of men or the dean of the college, and discover later, when talking to an "independent" counsellor, that many things simply did not turn up in the first case, but were kept back automatically by an unconscious adjustment to the situation.

One cannot fail to recognize that this absolute independence of the counsellor may also have its disadvantages. A social worker, for instance, acting as a counsellor, may discover that the client consistently and for a long time cheated the agency or obtained assistance under false pretenses. Nonetheless, in principle, the counsellor ought to consider himself bound by professional secrecy. If the individual is to be helped, and so indirectly also a service rendered to the greater whole, the security supplied by the guarantee of secrecy must not be weakened. In this regard, the position of the counsellor is like that of the physician. There are, of course, particular problems which might arise in connection with this obligation of secrecy, but they would demand too lengthy an explanation and treatment to be discussed here.

The counsellor should avoid interfering in any way with the life of his client otherwise than by advice. Even if he might

exercise a beneficient influence, for example, by clearing up some misunderstandings between a student and a teacher, or by notifying the school authorities that the curriculum of this individual student is badly chosen, he ought to refrain from doing so. It is by far preferable that the student himself take the necessary steps. The counsellor will, if the case is handled in an appropriate manner, enable the student sooner or later to attain enough courage and clarity of view so as to manage his own affairs. The same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to all other counselling situations.

The "independence" of the counsellor with regard to authority, management, law, and discipline ought to find its expression also in the externalities of the set-up. This does not mean that the counsellor of students could not be a member of the faculty; but he should not be invested with any particular disciplinarian function, and the office where counselling takes place should not be any of the administrative offices. Furthermore, counselling of any sort is nothing which simple common sense or practical experience alone enables one to do. It is a technique to be learned, and it presupposes a thorough knowledge of many things.

That the counsellor must be a psychologist is obvious. That his psychology has to be more of the "understanding" or what sometimes is called "clinical" type than derived from the experiments of the laboratory is not less obvious. Not that he can do without a thorough acquaintance with the data of the laboratory. But as a witty mind once put it: to be an efficient practical psychologist and psychotherapist one has to have worked for years in the laboratory and for years have given up this kind of work. Psychology in practice is much more than mere psychology. Even for the scientifically minded psychologist it is true that he ceases to be a psychologist if he wants to be nothing more. Psychology is concerned with man in his totality. It must take in consideration the physical aspect of life not less than the mental. In recent years a new movement has developed under the heading of "Psychosomatic Medicine."[2] The dividing line

[2] Weiss and English, *Psychosomatic Medicine* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1943); Fl. Dunbar, *Psychosomatic Diagnosis*, (New York: P. B. Hoeber [Medic. Book Dpt. of Harper & Bros.], 1943); also the review *Psychosomatic Medicine*, appearing since 1939.

between mental and physical phenomena is no longer as well defined as it seemed a short time ago. Although the scholars working in this line seem not aware of it, the very theory of human nature for which they are looking as a foundation for their discoveries and endeavors is ready at hand. It is indeed no new discovery that every fact and process in man also has a "psychical" aspect, if not strictly speaking a mental one, since the body is what it is, alive and functioning, only by virtue of the informing rational soul to which every organ and every function owes its existence and nature. Contrary to a very common, although quite erroneous, belief, it is not Scholasticism which creates an unbridgeable gap between body and mind. The unity of human nature was not broken by Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy, but by the exaggerated Platonic Dualism the modern world inherited from Descartes. It is remarkable that whenever one of the contemporary students of human nature desires to emphasize the unity of man and to vindicate it against a mistaken dualism, he turns critically against a philosophy of an ultimately Cartesian type; that there exists any other conception of human nature is practically unknown to these writers.

In truth, if the principles of Thomistic anthropology were applied to the practical problems of psychology, as they become apparent in counselling or in psychotherapy, they would prove a great help and contribute in a noteworthy manner towards the clarification of many still very obscure questions. The counsellor desirous of basing his work on the solid foundation of a reliable philosophy cannot do better than to bring together these two: his knowledge of Thomistic principles, and the empirical facts gathered by the untiring efforts of psychologists, psychiatrists, and physicians.

Because of this unity of human nature, it is highly desirable, not to say absolutely necessary, that the counsellor be acquainted, and not by reading only, with the facts of psychopathology. There are many times when one is at a loss to say whether or not a case should be qualified as abnormal. In fact, it does not matter much what label is attached to it. The mode of procedure remains much the same. But, of course, one has to understand the abnormal processes and one has also to be aware of the danger they not seldom entail. The counsellor ought to be a trained psychiatrist; if he is also a physician, so much the better, especi-

ally because of the close interrelations between the bodily and mental facts which become more and more apparent with the progress of our knowledge in these things.

But neither psychologist nor psychiatrist can do an efficient work if he is not also fully conscious of the manifold contexts of practical and social life in which every individual is placed. To understand any person's conflicts one must be able to realize his particular position, relations with other people, the kind of his work and his attitude in regard to it, the problems his form of life is apt to bring about, the things in which he is interested, those who attract him, and those he loathes. This means that the practical psychologist or counsellor has to have a wide knowledge of life and its various forms.

This is true even of the counsellor whose activity is limited to a special type of individuals, as for instance, the students on a college campus. The counsellor should be acquainted with the particularities of the divers branches of study so as to be able to form a correct opinion on study difficulties; he should know about the various kinds of social activities in and outside of the campus. He also should have himself a wide range of interests. It is sometimes more useful to discuss with a person all kinds of impersonal problems or to let him talk on his interests than to concentrate immediately on the problems and difficulties which make him seek advice with the counsellor.

The counsellor should be freely accessible to any student or client. The client of a social agency should be able to ask for an appointment with the counsellor without having to give any special reason for it or having to mention the matter concerning which wants to see the counsellor. On the other hand, seeing the counsellor can be suggested by another person, a teacher or prefect, a social worker, or anyone having to do with personnel. But this suggestion should not have the character of a command nor, least of all, be formulated as a condition for the continuance of some state or eventually, a change in it. The teacher should not say to a student: "go and see the counsellor, or else." The effect would be to create a certain attitude of hostility and to make the activity of the counsellor appear as part of the disciplinarian machinery—just the kind of impression which must be avoided at any cost.

One question may have been in the mind of the reader. Why all this discussion of guidance and counselling? Did we not do quite all right without these modern inventions? And did not any experienced teacher, confessor, or any person with common sense and some knowledge of the actual situation do quite a decent job?

It is, of course, easy to answer that times have changed and demand changed methods. The question is, however, in what particular way have times changed so as to make counselling, a special technique, the establishment of such agencies, and a special training necessary? It seems improbable that conflicts were so much less frequent in bygone ages as to make any special form of counselling superfluous. Human nature is full of conflicts; one has but to recall well-known words, for instance in St. Paul, referring to the struggle going on within the human soul. Either man has become much less tolerant and less capable of dealing with his inner difficulties so that he is in need of help from without, or the kind of conflicts has become different so that unaided reason and will are no longer able to cope with them.

Both conditions apparently exist. Man has become less tolerant in many a sense. He seems to feel that he is entitled to a smooth and easygoing life and that any kind of difficulty he encounters is something like an injustice done to him. Accordingly, he resents difficulties and conflicts and looks at them as something that "ought not to be." He seems to have forgotten that conflict, that is, the painful necessity of choosing between values of different height, is essential to life and, indeed, the great motor power by which life, of the individual and of the race, moves onward. The widespread desire that things be arranged for him by all kind of agencies and the obviously quite general preference for some form of "paternalism" are manifestations of this attitude. Because he feels that difficulty and conflict are "unnatural," he also feels less able to deal with them. He no longer takes them in his stride, but bewails his lot if he is faced by obstacles of this nature. On the other hand, the conflicts besetting human life have not, so far as one can see, fundamentally changed their nature. Objectively viewed, they are the same ones which always accompanied human existence. But subjectively envisioned, they have taken on another meaning. They have, first, lost the character of being a kind of test to

which man is put so as to show himself worthy of his higher destiny. This character has disappeared together with the knowledge that man *has* such a higher destiny. Secondly, under the influence of an utopian notion of a terrestrial paradise, to be achieved presently, particularly with the aid of science, the idea of life as a battle—*bonum certamen*—has been deprived of its meaning. In other words, life has no meaning any more. Having no meaning, it does not supply any standard by which to judge and by which to arrange one's private existence.

A terrifyingly large number of people have no courage whatsoever when forced by circumstances to face themselves and to realize the truth about themselves, as individual persons and as representatives of mankind in general. There is no doubt that anxiety and dread play a greater role to-day in individual life than they did ever before. In spite of the apparently greater security modern life provides, by hygiene and all sorts of social and technological institutions, man in fact is more insecure than he was ever before. That there is so much talk to-day about "neurosis" is not only the effect of our knowing more about neurotic states; there is a definite increase in frequency. The basic trait of the neurotic personality is insecurity and anxiety.

The average person has no longer any secure and reliable basis upon which to take his stand and from which to work out the solution of his difficulties. Because he lacks such a standpoint, the mere common sense explanation or advice does not help him in his troubles. He must be made to see himself first in his true nature before he can attempt any such solution. To lead anyone to self-knowledge who as yet does not possess the correct principles for such a task is not easy. To clear a road from some dust or rubbish the wind swept there, is easy. But to remove a landslide the art of the engineer is needed. If the way to self-knowledge and a proper interpretation of a person's problems is barred by the accumulation of all sort of entanglements and misunderstandings, mere commonsense and the knowledge of the principles alone will not do; a special technique, much time and patience, the ability to find the way from the general principle to the particular problem, become indispensable.

Here as elsewhere, prevention is, of course, better than cure. If men are taught how to face their problems and from what viewpoint to envisage them, they may not be so much in need of

a counsellor. The task, however, of preparation for real life and its difficulties is not achieved either by instituting courses on "how to develop one's personality" nor by avoiding "frustration" as far as feasible. Personality cannot develop unless there is supplied to it a material content by which to actualize its potentialities. Self-expression, so much emphasized to-day, is meaningless if the self is but an empty shell without any material content which to express. "Frustration" is not nearly so dangerous as some people, too much influenced by naturalistic and hedonistic conceptions, believe; life is filled with "frustrations," and the years of growth and education must prepare man for this fact. What ever danger there may be in frustration, it can be avoided if a man is shown higher and more satisfying goals to replace those forbidden by moral and social law. This process of substitution of approved goals for those which have to be denied can and must start in childhood. To postpone the arquisition of this attitude is a serious mistake, and renders adjustment to reality not easier, as many believe, but more difficult or even sometimes, unattainable.

It is the idea of the "relativity of values," the destruction of all absolute standards, which has made man so unable to face his destiny that he needs another person, as guide and counsellor, to set him straight again. Whereas, on one hand, a strictly "directive" procedure in counselling bars the way to success, a certain amount of consideration of objective and absolute laws—and these laws are mainly laws of value-order—is indispensable. To find the right middle between "directive" counselling and pure subjectivistic emphasis on personality alone, is the great task in counselling. The former procedure will prove effective only when the individual has already by himself achieved a more than merely intellectual or theoretical acknowledgement of the objective law. In other cases some success may be achieved, but it will prove neither durable nor really deep. The apparent success often consists only in the fact that the one counselled puts over the responsibility for decision and action to the counsellor. Instead of becoming free and responsible, these people develop an unsound dependance. We see this frequently with certain neurotics who, instead of sheltering behind their symptoms and evading reality by these means, hide behind the person of their adviser.

There is, of course, much more to be said on the problems of guidance and counselling. But the few remarks of the foregoing pages may suffice to underscore the importance of the whole question as well as some of the particular viewpoints to be considered.[3]

RUDOLF ALLERS

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[3] I hope to be able, in not too distant a time, to discuss more thoroughly one problem on which I could just touch here. The recent studies in psychosomatic medicine and medical psychology have brought to the foreground and, up to a degree, enabled us to understand better the rather mysterious relations obtaining between an individual's character and his destiny. An analysis of the facts and theories concerning this question proves to be very interesting from the viewpoint of a "philosophical anthropology" as well as from the viewpoint of practical guidance and education.

MISSION INTENTION

"The Missions to the Mohammedans in North Africa, Syria and Java" is the Mission Intention for the month of August, 1945.

AN AMERICAN THEOLOGIAN ON THE CHURCH

The Church is the mystic extension, through the world and through succeeding ages, of the mystery of the Incarnation. Thus Jesus Christ is universal teacher, "the same yesterday, today, and forever." Being Himself while on earth "the way, the truth, and the life," He is still found, after His visible withdrawal by His ascent into heaven, invisible in His Church, which is His body. He guides His Church, and lives and teaches in it and by it, and thus "all nations" can learn the truths of religion from Christ teaching by His Church.

A knowledge of what the Church teaches is therefore of supreme importance to all men. Her teaching is the proposition of the doctrines of Jesus Christ, and her life is the Christian religion in action.

—The Most Rev. John M'Gill, Bishop of Richmond, *Creed of Catholics, or, The Doctrines of Our Faith* (Baltimore, 1885), pp. xii f.

CENSURES FOR THE CONFESSOR

The chart on the following pages was prepared in the hope of making more easily available to the priest busy with his manifold daily duties the censures contained in the third part of the fifth book of the Code of Canon Law. Being schematic it cannot supplant, but can only supplement the regular texts on Moral Theology and Canon Law, putting in abbreviated alphabetical form for easier reference what is there explained at length.

In making up the chart we have used the word "Anyone" to indicate that the censure in question may be involved whether the penitent is cleric, religious, or a lay person. The confessor will, of course, interpret this in the sense that the penitent must have been bound by a law or precept to which the censure in question is annexed, or he will not have incurred the censure.[1] Even among those who at first might appear to be covered by the general laws of the Church some are exempted as to penal matters, either on account of office, e.g. Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, as to all penalties, and Bishops, as to suspensions and interdicts *latae sententiae;*[2] or on account of age, e.g. those who have not yet reached the age of puberty, for whom corrective measures are recommended.[3]

If there has been a change in the law the one who committed the delict is ordinarily to be punished according to whichever law is more favorable to him,[4] so that if the previous law has been abolished or even the penalty annexed thereto has alone been stricken from the records the penalty ceases to exist. In the cases considered here, however, if the censure has already attached to the penitent upon commission of the delict it must be absolved even if there have been subsequent changes in the law, so it is sufficient to consider what penalty existed at the time the delict was committed.[5]

The confessor will be extremely careful not to assume that the penitent has incurred the censure in question, since no penalty can be inflicted unless it is proved with certainty that a delict was committed,[6] and the penalty established in the law is not incurred unless the delict is perfect in its kind according to the proper meaning of the words of the law.[7] In other terms, the penitent is not under

[1] Cf. Can. 2226, § 1.
[2] Cf. Can. 2227, §2.
[3] Cf. Can. 2230.
[4] Cf. Can. 2226, §2.
[5] Cf. Can. 2226, §3.
[6] Cf. Can. 2233, §1.
[7] Cf. Can. 2228.

censure unless he has done the precise thing which is forbidden in Canon Law under pain of the censure in question. What that precise thing is we have indicated briefly in the chart, realizing that the confessor can find the subject treated fully and competently in the regular texts.

Even if it appears from the facts as stated that the penitent has done the precise thing forbidden under penalty of incurring the censure in question, the confessor will still need to investigate to see whether there may not be some excusing causes whereby the penitent in reality has not incurred the censure.

Ignorance of the law, or of the penalty alone, may or may not be an excusing cause whereby the penitent is not under the censure. Affected ignorance, of course, is no excuse, even though the law is set forth in words which call for full knowledge and deliberation, e.g. *praesumpserit*.[8] Crass or supine ignorance excuses the penitent if the law uses the aforesaid words which call for full knowledge and deliberation; but does not if those words are lacking. Simple ignorance excuses the penitent.[9]

Drunkenness, lack of due care, weakness of mind, the impetus of passion, are excuses only if they render the act less than gravely culpable, i.e. if they change the sin from mortal to venial.[10]

Fear excuses the penitent, provided that it is grave and that the delict in question did not tend to contempt of the faith or of ecclesiastical authority or to public damage to souls.[11]

If the censure has been incurred the penitent is bound by it no matter where he may go.[12] Though he may be excused from observing it until a declaratory sentence has been given, if infamy would follow from such observance, the censure binds the penitent in the internal forum even though he does not have to observe it exteriorly.[13] If the censure is reserved the confessor cannot absolve it directly unless he has the necessary faculties,[14] hence we have indicated how the censures are reserved and to whom the confessor should recur to obtain the faculties to absolve therefrom.

If the case is occult the Ordinary can remit penalties *latae sententiae* mentioned in the Code which are reserved to the Holy See

[8] Cf. Can. 2229, §1.
[9] Cf. Can. 2229, §2, §3, 1°.
[10] Cf. Can. 2229, §3, 2°.
[11] Cf. Can. 2229, §3, 3°.
[12] Cf. Can. 2226, §4, but if the censure is merely reserved in a particular territory one may go outside of that territory to obtain absolution unless the censure is *ab homine* (Can. 2247, §2).
[13] Cf. Can. 2232, §1.
[14] Cf. Can. 2236, §1.

in simple manner and can grant faculties to the confessor to do so.[15] The faculties granted to confessors in virtue of Canon 2254, *"In casibus urgentioribus . . ."* as well as of Canon 882, *"In periculo mortis . . . ,"* of course, cover cases in which the confessor cannot have recourse to someone with authority to delegate him to absolve from the censure.

One who is excommunicated must be absolved before he can receive the sacraments, therefore before he can be absolved from his sins.[16] One who is under a personal interdict is in the same condition.[17] One who falls under the interdict from entry into the church cannot celebrate divine offices therein or assist at them, but if he is present and assisting he does not have to be expelled, so it would seem that he could be absolved from his sins.[18] One who is suspended, it seems, can be absolved from his sins though the suspension has not yet been lifted.[19]

The formula for absolution to be used by the confessor is the usual one, ". . . *ab omni vinculo excommunicationis, suspensionis, et interdicti . . .*"[20]

The letters **Q** and **A** are used in the chart to indicate, respectively, the Index of Local Ordinaries' Quinquennial Faculties, and the Index of Faculties of Apostolic Legates. Because of their importance for confessors in the United States two censures from the decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore have been inserted in the chart.

One final word of caution should be added. The confessor may find that the penitent has incurred an *irregularitas* by reason of performance of an act of Orders, reserved to clerics in Sacred Orders, when he either did not possess such an Order, or had been forbidden to exercise it by some canonical penalty either personal, medicinal or vindicative, or local.[21] If the irregularity arose from an occult delict, with the exception of the irregularity which arises from voluntary homicide or abortion, or any other irregularity which has been taken to court, the Ordinary, in person or by a delegate, could dispense, as could the confessor were the case occult and so urgent that the Ordinary could not be reached and there was imminent danger of serious damage (infamy), but only to the extent that the penitent could exercise Orders already received."[22]

[15] Cf. Can. 2237, §2.
[16] Cf. Can. 2260, §1.
[17] Cf. Can. 2275, 2°.
[18] Cf. Can. 2277.
[19] Cf. Can. 2278-85.
[20] Cf. Can. 2250, §3.
[21] Cf. Can. 985, 7°.
[22] Cf. Can. 990.

INDEX	WHO AFFECTED	WHAT COVERED BY CENSURE
Abbot, benediction C. 2402	Abbots or Prelates *nullius*	Failure to receive benediction as required by law
Abortion C. 2350§1	Anyone	Procuring effected abortion
Accomplice, absolution of C. 2367	Priest	Absolving, or feigning to absolve his accomplice *in peccato turpi*
Apostasy	Anyone	Apostasy, heresy, schism
Assault and Battery against Pope C. 2343 §1	Anyone	Laying violent hands on the person
against Cardinal, Legate, Patriarch, Archbishop, or Bishop C. 2343 §2 §3	Anyone	Laying violent hands on the person
against clerics or religious C. 2343 §4	Anyone	Laying violent hands on the person
Blessed Sacrament C. 2320	Anyone	Throwing away the consecrated Species, or carrying them off or retaining them for an evil purpose
Books editors C. 2318 §1	Editors	Editing books to establish apostasy, heresy, or schism
readers C. 2318 §1	Anyone not having permission	Defending, or knowingly keeping, or reading books to establish apostasy, heresy, or schism or others forbidden by apostolic letters and marked on the Index with (†)

CENSURE	RESERVATION TO	PROCEDURE FOR CONFESSOR
Suspension "from jurisdiction"	No one	Confessor absolves
Excommunication	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary
Excommunication	Holy See, *specialissimo modo*	Faculties from the Cardinal Chief Penitentiary
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Bishop to receive abjuration secretly unless they were heretics spreading heresy among the faithful purposely (**Q**)
Excommunication	Holy See, *specialissimo modo*	Faculties from the Cardinal Chief Penitentiary
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Ordinary (proper)	Faculties from Ordinary
Excommunication	Holy See, *specialissimo modo*	Faculties from the Cardinal Chief Penitentiary
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Bishop (**Q**)

INDEX	WHO AFFECTED	WHAT COVERED BY CENSURE
Sacred Scripture C. 2318 §1	Authors and editors	Putting out editions of Sacred Scripture, annotations or commentaries thereon without permission
Burial (forbidden) command C. 2339	Anyone	Daring to command or compel ecclesiastical burial of infidels, apostates, heretics, schismatics, excommunicated or interdicted persons
grant C. 2339	Cleric	Willingly giving ecclesiastical burial to any of above
Cloister (violation) nuns' (solemn vows) C. 2342, 1°	Anyone	Violating cloister of nuns
admission to nuns' C. 2342, 1°	Religious women or anyone	Bringing in or admitting anyone not allowed in cloister
men's C. 2342, 2°	Women	Violating cloister of men
admission to men's C. 2342, 2°	Religious men or anyone	Admitting or bringing women into men's cloister
going out of C. 2342, 3°	Nuns	Going out of cloister unlawfully
Confession hearing C. 2322, 1°	Anyone not a priest	Hearing sacramental confession
hearing without jurisdiction C. 2366	Priest	Presuming to hear sacramental confession without necessary jurisdiction

CENSURE	RESERVATION TO	PROCEDURE FOR CONFESSOR
Excommunication	No one	Confessor absolves
Excommunication	No one	Confessor absolves
Interdict "from entering church"	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Bishop provided purpose was not gravely criminal (**Q**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Bishop provided purpose was not gravely criminal (**Q**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Bishop provided purpose was not gravely criminal (**Q**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Bishop provided purpose was not gravely criminal (**Q**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Suspension *a divinis*	No one	Confessor absolves

INDEX	WHO AFFECTED	WHAT COVERED BY CENSURE
absolution without faculties C. 2366	Priest	Presuming to absolve from reserved sins without necessary jurisdiction
absolution without faculties C. 2338 §1	Priest	Presuming to absolve without faculties from excommunications reserved to the Holy See *specialissimo vel speciali modo*
violation of seal C. 2369 § 1	Priest	Presuming to violate directly sacramental seal
Confessor failure to denounce C. 2368 §2	Anyone	Knowingly omitting to denounce within a month confessor soliciting
false denunciation C. 2363	Anyone	Falsely denouncing confessor to Superiors for solicitation
Council, appeal to C. 2332	Anyone	Appealing from Pope to Council
Court (lay) summon C. 2341	Anyone	Summoning Cardinal, Legate, Major Official of Roman Curia, own Bishop to lay judge
Court (lay) summon C. 2341	Anyone	Summoning any Bishop, Abbot or Prelate *nullius,* Supreme Superior of religion of Pontifical right
Court (lay) summon C. 2341	Cleric	Summoning another person who has the privilege to a lay judge without previous permission
Dimissorial letters C. 2374	Cleric	Approaching with malice Holy Orders without letters or with false dimissorials or before canonical age or *per saltum*

CENSURE	RESERVATION TO	PROCEDURE FOR CONFESSOR
Suspension from hearing confessions	No one	Confessor absolves
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Ordinary (C. 2337 §2)
Excommunication	Holy See, *specialissimo modo*	Faculties from the Cardinal Chief Penitentiary
Excommunication	No one	Confessor absolves, only if has denounced or seriously promises to do so
*Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Suspension *ab officio*	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary
Suspension from Order received	No one	Confessor absolves

* This *censure*, of course, *is* carefully to be distinguished from the *sin* which is reserved to the Holy See by Canon 894, i.e., that of accusing falsely an innocent priest of the crime of solicitation. Faculties to absolve this sin should be sought from the Cardinal Chief Penitentiary.

INDEX	WHO AFFECTED	WHAT COVERED BY CENSURE
Dimissorial letters C. 2409	Administrator of diocese	Granting dimissorials contrary to C. 958, §1, 3°
Documents C. 2405	Anyone	Withdrawing, destroying, concealing, making any substantial change in any document of a diocesan curia during vacancy of the see
Duels C. 2351 §1	Anyone	Engaging in, or provoking, accepting, assisting, or favoring, looking on purposely, permitting or not preventing
Excommunicated person (*vitandus*) assistance to C. 2338 §2	Anyone	Aiding or favoring *vitandus* in delict for which excommunicated
communication with C. 2338 §2	Clerics	Knowingly and willingly communicating with *vitandus in divinis* and receiving *in divinis officiis*
Force into clergy C. 2352	Anyone	Forcing man to embrace clerical state
into religion C. 2352	Anyone	Forcing man or woman into religion or to make a religious profession
Forgery C. 2360 §1	Anyone	Forging or falsifying letters, decrees, rescripts of Holy See or knowingly using such documents
Indulgences C. 2327	Anyone	Collecting money out of Indulgences
Interdict (cause) C. 2338 §4	Anyone	Causing local interdict or interdict on a group or community

CENSURE	RESERVATION TO	PROCEDURE FOR CONFESSOR
Suspension *a divinis*	No one	Confessor absolves
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Bishop, if case has not gotten into external forum. (**Q**) Otherwise from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	No one	Confessor absolves
Excommunication	No one	Confessor absolves
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Personal interdict	No one	Confessor absolves

INDEX	WHO AFFECTED	WHAT COVERED BY CENSURE
Jurisdiction C. 2334, 1°	Anyone	Issuing laws, mandates, decrees against liberty or rights of Church; impeding ecclesiastical jurisdiction by recurring to lay power
Letters or Acts of Holy See C. 2334, 2°	Anyone	Recurring to lay power to impede letters or acts of Holy See or its legates; preventing their promulgation or execution; injuring, or threatening addressees or others
Marriage clerics C. 2388 §1	Clerics *in sacris* and those contracting with them	Presuming to contract marriage even civilly
laity C. 2319 §1, 1°	Anyone	Marrying before minister contrary to c. 1063, §1. (Mixed marriages.)
laity (III Balt. n. 127)	Anyone	Marrying before minister
laity (III Balt. n. 124)	Anyone	Marrying after civil divorce
laity C. 2319 § 1, 2°	Anyone	Marrying with pact to educate children outside Catholic Church
laity C. 2319 §1, 3°	Anyone	Knowingly presuming to offer children to non-Catholic minister to be baptized
laity C. 2319 §1, 4°	Anyone	Knowingly delivering children to be reared or educated in a non-Catholic religion
religious C. 2388 §1	Those with solemn vows and those contracting with them	Presuming to contract marriage even civilly

CENSURE	RESERVATION TO	PROCEDURE FOR CONFESSOR
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Bishop as to those impeding jurisdiction by recurring to lay power (**Q**), from Apostolic Delegate for others (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary
Excommunication	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary
Excommunication	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary
Excommunication	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary
Excommunication	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary
Excommunication	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)

INDEX	WHO AFFECTED	WHAT COVERED BY CENSURE
religious C. 2388 §2	Those with simple perpetual vows and those contracting with them	Presuming to contract marriage even civilly
Masons, *et sim.* C. 2335	Anyone	Joining Masons or similar organizations
Mass C. 2322	Anyone not a priest	Simulating celebration of Mass
Office (ecclesiastical) C. 2400	Cleric	Presuming to resign office, benefice, or dignity in hands of lay person
Orders C. 2372	Cleric	Presuming to receive Holy Orders from one who is excommunicated, suspended, interdicted, after sentence, or from a notorious apostate, heretic, or schismatic
Property alienation C. 2347, 3°	Anyone	Knowingly neglecting to obtain approval of Holy See when required
usurpation C. 2346	Anyone	Presuming to usurp or convert to own use ecclesiastical property; presuming to prevent collection of crops or income therefrom
usurpation C. 2345	Anyone	Usurping or detaining property or rights of Roman Church
Relics C. 2326	Anyone	Making false relics, knowingly selling, distributing, or exposing them to public veneration

CENSURE	RESERVATION TO	PROCEDURE FOR CONFESSOR
Excommunication	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Bishop (**Q**)
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Suspension *a divinis*	No one	Confessor absolves
Suspension *a divinis*	Holy See	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	No one	Confessor absolves
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, *speciali modo*	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Ordinary	Faculties from Ordinary

INDEX	WHO AFFECTED	WHAT COVERED BY CENSURE
Religious apostate C. 2385	Religious	"Apostate from religious order"
fugitive C. 2386	Religious *in sacris*	"Fugitive"
Simony Holy Orders C. 2371	Cleric	Knowingly promoting by simony to Holy Orders or being so promoted
offices C. 2392, 1°	Anyone	Committing simony in offices, benefices, dignities of Church
Sacraments C. 2371	Cleric	Committing simony in administering sacraments

CENSURE	RESERVATION TO	PROCEDURE FOR CONFESSOR
Excommunication	Ordinary	Faculties from Bishop, if order lay or non-exempt; from Major Religious Superior, if exempt
Suspension	Major Religious Superior	Faculties from Major Religious Superior
Suspension	Holy See	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Excommunication	Holy See, simple	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)
Suspension	Holy See	Faculties from Apostolic Delegate (**A**)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

RECORD OF PRIVATE BAPTISM

Question: If the child of non-Catholic parents is baptized privately by a nurse in the hospital because the little one is in danger of death, is there an obligation on the part of the nurse to inform anyone of the Baptism or to make a record of it, in the event that the child recovers?

Answer: In the case described a record of the Baptism should be kept either by the hospital chaplain or (preferably) by the pastor of the place where the child's parents reside. The nurse should see that information is given to either of these two. The record in question should be kept in a private book, not in the regular baptismal register. If it is evident that the child's parents would not object to the Baptism or may even have desired it, they can be informed. (Cf. McAllister, *Emergency Baptism* [Milwaukee, 1945], pp. 17 f.)

DOUBTFUL IMPOTENCE

Question: Is a priest permitted to revalidate the civil marriage of a woman who has had an operation in which her fallopian tubes were excised?

Answer: The question whether or not a woman is impotent as regards the contracting and the use of marriage if she has lost both ovaries or both fallopian tubes has been extensively discussed by theologians for many years, and the matter is still uncertain. However, the more common opinion nowadays holds that such defects do not constitute impotence, so that a woman in this condition may marry validly and lawfully make use of marital relations. At any rate, in practise, since this opinion is at least probable, marriage is not to be forbidden to such a woman, according to the principle laid down in Canon 1068, §2: "If the impediment of impotence is doubtful, with a doubt of either law or fact, marriage is not to be impeded." The same principle would allow such a woman the use of marriage already contracted.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

HEBREW TRIBAL INTERMARRIAGE

Question: Was it the custom at the time of our Lord for the tribes to intermarry? For example, Elizabeth is mentioned as the cousin of our Lady, yet both belonged to different tribes—Levi and Juda.

Answer: Generally speaking, Hebrews belonging to different tribes could intermarry at will. One exception, however, must be noted. A daughter who inherited her father's estate, either because he had no male issue or because all his sons were dead at the time of his demise, could only marry a man of her father's tribe. Had she been permitted to marry a man of another tribe, her father's estate would have passed to the ownership of her husband by inheritance. But land acquired by this title and not by sale could not be redeemed in the year of jubilee. Thus the estate of the heiress would have belonged permanently, although indirctly, to the tribe of her husband. Hence the territory of one tribe would have been diminished, while that of another would have been increased. Moses, however, wished the territory of each tribe to remain intact. Hence he passed the law concerning the marriage of heiresses (cf. *Num.* 27:1-11; 36:6-9; *Jos.* 17:3-6; *Lev.* 21:7, 13-14). If Elizabeth of the tribe of Juda married Zachary of the tribe of Levi, it follows that she was not an heiress.

THE SERPENT OF *GEN.* 3:1-15

Question: In the account of the Fall (*Gen.* 3:1-15), God cursed the serpent. Did that curse actually apply to the serpent as a serpent, namely, that it would have to crawl on the ground, and beforehand did it move otherwise than at present?

Answer: The reply to this question is determined by the manner in which we interpret the serpent in the passage under discussion. The tempter, who is called the serpent in Genesis, is identified with the devil or Satan in both the Old and the New Testament (*Wis.* 2:24; *John* 8:44; *Apoc.* 12:9; 20:2). This does not justify us in assuming that his serpentine appearance had no objective reality and that Satan is merely figuratively designated as a serpent on account of the similarity of his character with that of a serpent. This assumption is rendered nugatory by *Gen.* 3:1, which declares that the serpent was shrewder than any other animal made by God.

This statement classes the serpent with the beasts and implies that Satan tempted man in the guise of the reptile in question. It follows, also, from the fact that the tempter is counted among the animals, that the serpentine disguise which Satan assumed could not have been a mere subjective illusion confined to the sensitive faculties of our first parents, without any extraneous basis in fact. Consequently, the snake-like form of the devil must have had an objective reality. This reality may be explained in either of two ways: (1) Satan concealed himself beneath the semblance of a serpent, so that the serpent was a phantom or objective illusion; (2) The evil spirit took possession of a serpent which God had created and placed in Paradise.

That the first of these two possibilities is tenable is shown by the ineffectiveness of the objections which are proposed against it. To begin with, attention is called to the fact that the serpent is numbered among the animals. But this merely proves, as we have already pointed out, that the serpentine form of the tempter was objective; it does not decide whether this form appertained to a real animal or to a phantom produced by Satan. Secondly, it is objected that the serpent is said to have been shrewder than all the animals which God had made. But this does not demonstrate that the serpent was one of the animals which God had made; all we may legitimately deduce from this statement is that the reptilic tempter surpassed in cleverness the beasts among whom he was found.

It is argued, further, against the hypothesis of a phantom serpent that the terms of the curse pronounced upon the serpent suppose a real animal. Now the only part of this curse which could possibly relate to a real animal is contained in 3:14: "Because thou hast done this thing, thou shalt be accursed among all the cattle and among all the beasts of the field. Upon thy belly shalt thou crawl and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life" (Hebrew text). The remainder of the malediction, as exegetes are generally agreed, refers to Satan exclusively.

In refutation of the hypothesis of a phantom serpent stress is laid upon the fact that the serpent is declared accursed among the animals. But this does not indicate with cogency that Satan used a real animal. The curse may have associated him with the beasts because by his phantom disguise he had chosen to resemble them.

Furthermore, licking the dust is a figurative expression in the Old Testament for abject submission (*Is.* 49:25; *Mich.* 7:17; *Ps.* 72:9). Eating dirt had a similar meaning in the Canaanite language, as is evident from the Tell Amarna tablets. Hence the crawling movements and the eating of dust to which the serpent is condemned may be metaphorical, signifying the contempt and humiliation which Satan will suffer in consequence of his deception. These expressions, therefore, do not compel us to assume that a real animal was used by Satan. Accordingly, if the serpent was no more than a phantom, the entire passage (3:14) refers to Satan alone. It would be ludicrous to suppose that a mere phantom was execrated in the language employed by the text. The supposition that the serpent was an objective illusion created by Satan is not contradicted by the decree of the Biblical Commission on the historicity of the first three chapters of Genesis. This merely states that Satan tempted man "sub specie serpentis"; it does not define whether the "species" was a real animal or an objective illusion.

Let us now consider the second hypothesis which assumes that Satan took possession of the organism of a real serpent. Even in this supposition, it is not altogether clear that the animal which Satan is thought to have used as an instrument was cursed. All the details of the malediction in *Gen.* 3:14 may be applied to Satan himself. He may have been pronounced accursed among the animals because he inhabited a serpent. The remaining portion of the curse may be figurative, as we have already explained.

It is possible, however, to refer the words of *Gen.* 3:14 to a real serpent. The authors espousing this view think that the animal was cursed because he became an instrument of sin. But they differ widely in their interpretation of the malediction pronounced upon him. Some maintain that the serpent of Paradise was originally a reptile with feet and that he was deprived of them as a result of the Fall. Others believe that the serpent moved more erect before the Fall. Still others are of the opinion that the animal lost none of its natural characteristics because of the Fall and that these became a curse to him as a penalty for his co-operation in sin.

But if the slithering movements and the dirt which he absorbs were natural to the serpent, how could they ever become a curse? That is not easy to grasp. Perhaps these peculiarities of the serpent identified him after the Fall as having been a tool of the evil spirit and so made him hateful to mankind. In view of these

difficulties, it is easier to suppose that the serpent was a phantom and that the words of the curse apply exclusively to Satan in the sense already explained.

To sum up: if the serpent was a phantom, no curse was placed on him and his kind; if he was a real animal, this is possible but not certain; if the curse is assumed, it most probably wrought no intrinsic change in the organism of the animal.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

THE HISTORY OF A CONVERSION

I determined to examine the questions between Catholics and Protestants thoroughly, so far as my limited opportunities and poor abilities would permit. In the prosecution of this design, I procured all the works, on both sides, within my reach, and examined them alternately, side by side. This investigation occupied all my spare time for about eighteen months. . . . Besides this, I prayed humbly and sincerely, that I might first know the truth, and then have the grace to follow it wherever it might lead me. I examined carefully, prayerfully, and earnestly, until I was satisfied, beyond a doubt, that the Old Church was the true, and the only true Church.

> "And I said, if there's peace to be found in the world,
> The heart that was humble might hope for it here."

And in this I was not mistaken. I found her, as holy Cyprian of old had said, "The house of unity and peace." I mean to live and die in her communion.

—Peter H. Burnett, *The Path which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church* (New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers, undated). Pp. vii f. (The first edition of this work appeared in 1859.)

AT THE SECOND PLENARY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE

Archbishop Spalding wished earnestly that the Holy See would establish a Chapter of Canons in each diocese of the United States, such as existed in England, Ireland, Mexico, and even in Canada, an English province.

—John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States from the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1843, to the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1866* (New York, 1892), p. 718.

Book Reviews

CHRISTIANITY IN THE MARKET-PLACE. By Michael de la Bedoyere. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company (undated). Pp. 137. $2.00.

Some critics have considered this a very good book, and they have advanced serious reasons in support of their opinion. No one would deny that it is a thoughtful and a thought-provoking book. And yet, to the present reviewer at least, it is distinctly unsatisfying.

The author (who is the editor of the London *Catholic Herald*) has "tried to face the problem of Christianity's practical failure to impress the contemporary world" (p. 7). He is disturbed, as many men are, at the spectacle of multitudes outside the Church devoting themselves to the propagation of some "new order" or materialistic panacea for the world's ills far more zealously than Christians in general are striving to bring to men the faith by which, presumably, they live and work. He maintains that the world can only be re-interested in the significance of Christianity as a way of life if the members of the Church bring Christianity "into the market-place," which involves "the resolution to apply fearlessly and by ever-repeated and ever-changing personal judgments the inspiration, teaching, and values of Christianity to every circumstance in which the Christian may find himself" (p. 67).

Now, any admonition to members of the Church to live up to their faith fearlessly and openly can merit only praise. It is not a new admonition. It has its source in the words of our Lord Himself, and it has been repeated by His appointed teachers from the very origin of the Catholic Church. (It was, for instance, the constant *motif* of the eloquent appeals to Catholic Action issued by the late Pope Pius XI.) Count de la Bedoyere, as far as the main purpose of his book is concerned, is in the great tradition, and he is continuing a plea for genuine Christian *living* that cannot be too often repeated.

It is not the fundamental aim of *Christianity in the Market-Place* which seems unsatisfactory, but the attitude of the author regarding the concrete lines of "reform and change" which would help to equip Christianity if it is to "interest, impress, and help a shattered world" (p. 97). It would seem that the book must ultimately be judged, not on its repetition of a truism, but on the particular and specific recommendations it makes.

Catholics, if they are to take their position in the market-place, must be prepared. Count de la Bedoyere suggests the manner in which education, the parish and the family, and Catholic organization throughout the country must contribute to this preparation.

In his section on "education," the author's position is rather peculiar. "It is not surprising," he writes, "—as many have found in practice—that the Catholic child with a good Catholic home sometimes fares better as a Catholic in a non-Catholic school. For in a non-Catholic environment the contrast between home and school forces the child to think for itself, and to build up its own Catholic outlook in opposition to the school's secularist outlook. Too often in the Catholic school it is imbibing secularism under the impression that it is Christianity" (p. 101). The author's reference to Catholic schools and their failings is presumably based upon his knowledge of them as they exist in his own country, and a reviewer in the United States is hardly qualified to take issue with him regarding Catholic schools as they function in England; but we think that the experience of priests and Catholic educators in the United States, with reference to our own school children, would point to a conclusion quite different from that reached by Count de la Bedoyere. Further, he writes: "I am not indeed advocating the jettisoning of our Catholic schools, for the risk involved in that *under present conditions* [the italics are his] would be appalling" (pp. 102 f.). We wish that the author had explained that italicized qualification, and given us some idea of the future conditions under which the Catholic schools could be jettisoned *without* appalling risk.

In his treatment of "the parish and the family," Count de la Bedoyere makes a sound appeal for up-to-the-minute instruction, through the medium of the Sunday sermon, on the duties of the Catholic in the circumstances of his everyday life. However, he "personally" would suggest that "less stress should be laid on common devotional exercises, monthly communions, and the like" (p. 105). This whole section seems to be demanding lay "activity" in the market-place without taking into consideration fully enough the personal sanctification of the layman through the sacramental life of the Church—which sanctification must be present before the Catholic can really spread his influence (*as a Catholic*) abroad in the world.

Regarding "Catholic organisation throughout the country," the author desires lay workers whose "independence of outlook" and "experience" "will prove precious guarantees against the 'sacristification' and theocratic tendencies of Catholic organisations" (p. 107). The word "sacristification," of course, is a familiar gibe, too often applied to sincere and pious Catholic lay people who are working, to the best of their ability, for our Lord and His Church. But "theocratic"? In what sense is the author using "theocratic" when he regards such tendencies as a danger in Catholic organizations against which we must have "precious guarantees"? And is it at all fair or reasonable to say of "the whole social action of the Church" that "At present it

can only be called, from top to bottom, narrow, provincial, petty"? (pp. 107 f.).

There are other features of *Christianity in the Market-Place* which seem unsatisfactory. The author has a distinction between "the limitations of the Church's commission" and "the all-embracing nature of the Divine pattern" (p. 113) which does not seem to be sound as he develops it. We doubt if his conception of co-operation among adherents of various religious beliefs (pp. 109-17) is much of a contribution to the considerable literature on the subject. Many of his sentences will make the reader wonder about their meaning and implication; for instance: "Here the Church's teaching about the indissolubility of marriage and the sinfulness of birth-control seems to many sincere persons seeking the light utterly unacceptable, and in its extreme interpretation wholly formalistic and unreal" (pp. 36 f.). Just what is the "*extreme* interpretation" of the Church's teaching on these points?

Granting the author's sincerity of purpose and the justice of his appeal for true Christian living on the part of the laity, *Christianity in the Market-Place* seems to this reviewer to be tainted by the very secularism against which it inveighs. It must be emphasized that this is the personal opinion of one reviewer. Catholic priests in the United States should read this book. They may arrive at a conception of it different from the one presented in this review. *Christianity in the Market-Place* is at least a stimulus to thought, even if that thought arrives at disagreement. For this stimulus Count de la Bedoyere is to be thanked.

E. D. Benard

Freedom Through Education. By John D. Redden and Francis A. Ryan. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1944. Pp. xi + 204. $2.50.

This work is a definite contribution to a growing Catholic literature in the philosophy and principles of education. It is especially needed today for, as the authors point out, "with the stones of naturalism, socialism, nationalism, communism, and experimentalism, men have attempted to build an arrogant Tower of Babel; and the curse of the confusion of tongues has fallen, leaving them bewildered in this valley of shadow" (p. 1). In contrast to such philosophies, the authors clearly show that it is only through Christian principles applied to education that man can preserve and enjoy his fundamental freedoms and that it is only through a sound Christian life that the democratic way of life may fully implement in practice freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

The aims of education have been derived from the Christian teaching

on the origin, nature, and destiny of man. Furthermore, the proper rights and duties of the individual, society, the Church, and government are recognized in their proper relations to God. For that reason clear and forceful distinctions have been made between the true and false foundations of the four freedoms. For effectiveness the freedoms must be based upon a moral foundation derived from the *philosophia perennis* and divine revelation.

Freedom of speech or expression simply implies the right to teach truth and not error as such. In its application to education it means "that the pupil should be taught how to see relationships of cause and effect, how the content, materials and experiences of the curriculum function in actual life situations. . . . Thus, in the fields of languages, art, music, the social studies, etc., the child must be given the opportunity for self-realization so that he may form ideas and express them creatively, in conformity, of course, with approved standards governing the exercise of this freedom, common courtesy, and the moral law" (pp. 178 f).

Freedom of religion demands that children be not indoctrinated in false teachings. Thus the curriculum should be so constructed and organized as to include religious materials that do not exclude "fundamental religious truths, such as the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will, and man's redemption by Jesus Christ" (p. 179).

Education must provide for the spiritual, intellectual, physical, and vocational needs of the child. If freedom from want is to be realized, then education "must help the child to become self-supporting and self-directing" (p. 179). At the same time his social consciousness must be directed towards the Christian reconstruction of society. Hence, the school should teach the child the causes of poverty and evaluate those causes and human wants according to Christian standards.

Education for freedom from fear is not to be interpreted as mere freedom from war or from an unjust aggressor, however desirable and important such education unquestionably is. Indeed, the child should be so educated as to know "what he is properly to fear and what not to fear" (p. 180). It is only through the application in his daily living of the teachings of true religion and of sound mental hygiene that he can be prepared "to face reality, and to effect an intelligent solution of his individual and social problems in a manner that provides him with maximum security" (p. 180).

The book is a good antidote to the philosophies of American education which make democracy a religion in itself rather than acknowledge that the bases and sanctions of all true democracy have their ultimate source in a personal God.

TIMOTHY F. O'LEARY

AN INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY. By Paul J. Glenn, Ph.D., S.T.D. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1944. Pp. viii + 408. $3.00.

With this volume Dr. Glenn rounds out his philosophical series of eleven books, a very useful set of class manuals covering not only all the standard branches but including also a philosophy of society (Sociology) and of the Catholic religion (Apologetics). As might be expected these textbooks are not all of uniform merit but they maintain such a consistently high average that the author is well deserving of the gratitude and appreciation of all those interested in the spread of Scholasticism.

There are, of course, numerous introductions to philosophy even in the English language alone and to appraise any one of them would almost necessitate an introduction to Introductions. Their value and importance will obviously vary according to the type of student envisioned, the specific purpose the teacher has in mind, in addition to such inherent qualities as selection and sequence of subjects and the clearness with which they are presented. As happens frequently in social life an introduction may become so complex and involved that we learn precisely nothing from it, not even the name of the one whose acquaintance we are supposed to make. Dr. Glenn creates no such hubbub of elegant nothingness; he really introduces the student or general reader to the perennial wisdom; he shows him both the wood and the trees, the first part of his book supplementing the definition of philosophy by means of an historical summary and the second part indicating its main provinces and problems.

This combination of the historical with the analytical results in a good presentation, at least in the traditional sense. To call attention to certain minor points in a work of this kind may seem hypercritical but Averröes is still accused of teaching the error of "the double truth" (p. 120); some fairly important figures such as Scotus Erigena are omitted; scant reference is made to the great works in philosophy (the *Summa Contra Gentiles* is mentioned once, the *Summa Theologica* never) and the casual reader whose curiosity may be aroused is given no indication as to where he may find further information. In the hands of a capable, zealous teacher such slight defects in a textbook may mean little. But the real issue centers around the degree of emphasis given to the contemporary viewpoint. While it has not been entirely ignored it would seem that the challenge of today in such fields as axiology, philosophy of science, etc., has not been sufficiently met. To proceed from the better known to the less known is still a good pedagogical principle and our starting point ought to be some common denominator of which the modern mind is keenly aware. If we fail to establish this living contact with the present our philosophy will be relegated to the realm of history just as art is now largely assigned to the museum.

To be sure, we may scarcely expect at this stage to discover any new ultimate concepts. Nevertheless, Scholasticism can and must grow by assimilating the experiences of each succeeding generation and giving them interpretation in the light of the eternal verities. We need not necessarily cater to the superficial spirit and the flair for secondhand and shoddy values characteristic of this age of digests and summaries. Indeed, from this point of view, the present multiplication and popularity of introductions, especially on the higher educational level, is in itself a compromise necessitated by the intellectual temper of our time. But plowing old ground is not likely to be either productive or progressive. Other areas should be constantly sought for wider and deeper cultivation. It is to this task that the scholastic of the future must devote his energies. Otherwise we shall be merely erecting new tombstones in the cemetery of fruitless endeavors.

W. J. McDonald

Saints for Girls. By a Servite Nun. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1944. Pp. 208. $2.00.

The anonymous author of this book, alarmed at the evil effects produced by our materialistic age, and especially by the present war, on both the mind and heart of our young girls, offers them in twelve comprehensive sketches the wondrous lives of twelve heroines of Christianity. The book is written in a familiar tone and is arranged without regard to chronology. The twelve Lives are in the following order: Our Lady, St. Anne, St. Juliana, The Little Flower, Queen Jadwiga of Poland, Catherine Labouré, St. Gemma Galgani, St. Zita, St. Margaret of Scotland, St. Lidwina, St. Rita of Cascia, and St. Bernadette Soubirous. Every sketch contains enough information about the life and character of the person to make the saint live again and serve as an incentive and inspiration to the girls of our day.

Every saint of God is a living monument to Christian ideals and Christian heroism. The hero-worship so common among young people may find in the lives of the saints worthy objects of both admiration and imitation. Practically every young person is well acquainted with the name of the various "stars" of stage and screen of our day; the names of the saints, whose enduring glory will outshine the ephemeral fame of clever artists and mortal beauty, are unknown. One is often discouraged in reading the biography of a saint because of the many historical and doctrinal digressions crowded into the volume. The inspirational value decreases in proportion to the critical apparatus. In these sketches one finds nothing but edification. There is a picture for each one of the saints.

The book has no *Imprimatur* and is anonymous. The first of these omissions may be due to a dispensation, the second to modesty. In this

reviewer's estimation, an anonymous book is rather like an anonymous letter. It requires greater virtue, and more humility, to face adverse criticism than it does to decline well-deserved praise for the work published.

PASCAL P. PARENTE

PRIESTHOOD. Conferences on the Rite of Ordination. By the Reverend Aloysius Biskupek, S.V.D. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1945. Pp. vi + 398. $3.50.

So many books have been written on the priesthood, and among them so many classics, that there would scarcely seem to be room for another. But Fr. Biskupek in entering the field has chosen a formula which should assure for his work a long-lived popularity. As in his two previous works, *Subdeaconship* and *Deaconship*, he has set himself simply to provide a commentary on the text of the Ordination ceremony. By adhering closely to the text and by drawing constantly upon it, he has produced a treatise that is theologically sound and solidly inspirational.

Fr. Biskupek's book is a clear indication of the fact that it is difficult to find a more adequate and more truly moving presentation of the sacramental rites in which the Church honors God and sanctifies herself, than that which appears in the official liturgical books. The power and grandeur of the sacraments are nowhere so evident as in the age-old ceremonies and prayers prescribed as the setting for the divinely instituted actions. Because this is true to a marked degree of the ceremonies and prayers of priestly ordination, all priests regard attendance at an Ordination ceremony as a most efficacious means of renewing their priestly ideal. For the same reason, they will welcome Fr. Biskupek's conferences as a ready means of keeping that ideal before them.

Two minor flaws may be noted. Since from their studies all priests are conscious of the complexities of the problem, even though the character of his work excludes a more adequate treatment of it, the author might be less apodictic in the position he assumes as to the nature of sacrifice (pp. 255-57). Again, few priests will agree that "next to the prostration of the ordinands and the imposition of hands, the anointing of the priest's hands is the most impressive ceremony of the rite" (p. 227). Surely the *traditio instrumentorum*, with its historical significance and its direct relation to the Sacrifice of the Mass as the priest's chief work, is both a more important and a more impressive ceremony.

JAMES EDWARD REA